LIBRARY
Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.
No. Case, Div. 1
No. Shelf, Section 4
No. Book,

The John M. Krebs Donation.

SCC
1583
v. 1

THE

OECONOMY

OF THE

COVENANTS,

BETWEEN

GOD AND MAN.

COMPREHENDING

A Complete Body of Divinity.

By HERMAN WITSIUS, D. D.

Late Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſities of Franequer, Utrecht, and Leyden ; and alſo Regent of the Divinity-College of the States of Holland and Weſt Frieſland.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,

THE LIFE OF THE AUTHOR.

A New Tranſlation from the Original Latin.

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME I.

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED BY GEORGE FORMAN, No. 64, WATER-STREET,
FOR LEE & STOKES, No. 25, MAIDEN LANE.

1798.

PREFACE TO THE EDINBURGH EDITION, BY THE TRANSLATOR.

THE following celebrated work of the great WITSIUS, originally wrote in elegant Latin, was firſt publiſhed when the author was Profeſſor of Divinity at Franequer. It paſſed through two editions before the year 1693, when he republiſhed it with very conſiderable additions and improvements, and prefixed a dedication to King William III. the glorious deliverer of the Britiſh nation from all the horrors of popery and ſlavery, and a pacific addreſs to the Reverend the profeſſors of divinity and miniſters of the goſpel in the United Provinces. The book was eagerly read and highly valued by all, who had a true taſte for the excellent goſpel-truths it contains and illuſtrates. A tranſlation of it into Engliſh was firſt publiſhed, in three large volumes Octavo, at London, in 1763; and, though indifferently executed, yet met with great encouragement. A demand being made for the work in this country, freed from the many groſs typographical blunders and other errors with which the London copy abounded, the Editor has been prevailed upon to review the whole tranſlation; has carefully compared every ſentence with the original, corrected many miſtakes, ſupplied a variety of omiſſions, and endeavoured to give the author's true ſenſe. In making the tranſlation, the ſeveral editions have been conſulted, particularly the third, and one printed at Herborn in 1712, four years after the author's death. And though the Editor dare not ſay, the work is free from faults, yet he flatters himſelf the Public will overlook all inaccuracies, and favorably receive a book, honeſtly intended and plainly calculated for general utility.

As this excellent Body of Divinity was for near a century only known to perſons ſkilled in the learned languages, to the very great loſs of thoſe who had not received a liberal education; and as every attempt for ſpreading the knowledge of goſpel-truths, particularly thoſe relating to the covenants of works and grace, which enter ſo deeply into the Mediatorial ſcheme, merits the public atten-

tion; so the Editor hopes, that his countrymen will give suitable encouragement to a work, eminently calculated for explaining the scriptural doctrines concerning the fall of man, and the method of his recovery by the obedience, satisfaction, and grace of the Lord Jesus Christ. And he begs, that ministers and other gentlemen who have read this work, and know the value thereof, will recommend it unto others, who have not enjoyed that advantage, as a book very proper to be read not only by the clergy and students of divinity, but by all sorts of persons with pleasure and profit.

The following recommendations were prefixed to the former English translation of this work.

"The famous HERMAN WITSIUS, Professor of Divinity at Leyden, in Holland, and the author of a treatise entitled, *The Oeconomy of the Covenants between God and Man*, and various other learned and theological tracts, was a writer, not only eminent for his great talents, and particularly solid judgment, rich imagination, and elegancy of composition; but for a deep, powerful, and evangelical spirituality and savour of godliness: and we most heartily concur in the recommendation of his works to serious Christians of all denominations, and especially to ministers, and candidates for that sacred office.

JOHN GILL, D. D.	JOHN BRINE,
JOHN WALKER, L. L. D.	WILLIAM KING,
THOMAS HALL,	THOMAS GIBBONS, M. A."

And the late excellent Mr. Hervey, in his *Theron and Aspasio*, vol. iii. p. 90. of his works, Edinburgh edition, 1769, having mentioned a work of this author, adds, "*The Oeconomy of the Covenants*, written by the same hand, is a Body of Divinity, in its method so well digested; in its doctrines so truly evangelical; and (what is not very usual with our systematic writers) in its language so refined and elegant; in its manner so affectionate and animating; that I would recommend it to every student in Divinity [and to *every Christian.*] I would not scruple to *risk all my reputation* upon the merits of this performance: and I cannot but lament it, as one of my greatest losses, that I was *no sooner* acquainted with this most excellent author; all whose works have such a delicacy of composition, and such a savour of holiness, that I know not any comparison more proper to represent their true character, than *the golden pot which had manna*; and was outwardly *bright* with burnished gold, inwardly *rich* with heavenly food."

AMERICAN RECOMMENDATION.

THE *Author of the* ŒCONOMY OF THE COVENANTS *was a Profeſſor of Divinity in Holland, very eminent for his piety, and juſtly celebrated for a writer of great talents, accurate judgment, and refined taſte. Among his works, which are all in high eſtimation with the learned of every denomination, there are none more intereſting and univerſally admired than this upon the Covenants. Great erudition, ſolid argument, and accurate criticiſm, are here happily employed in eſtabliſhing the truth and vindicating the peculiar doctrines of the Goſpel. No book that has been publiſhed ſince the reformation of the Church is more worthy the attention and ſtudy of candidates for the miniſtry; and every pious reader, who wiſhes to have his faith confirmed, and religious affections raiſed, will here be fully gratified. Thoſe who can peruſe it in the original Latin, will diſcover a beauty and ſublimity of ſtyle, which the tranſlator has not been able to reach; the verſion however is abundantly accurate to convey the ideas, and is not deſtitute of ſufficient neatneſs to pleaſe a candid reader.*

As it has long been our wiſh that an American Edition of this invaluable work might appear, we comply without the leaſt heſitation with the requeſt of the Editor, to expreſs our ſentiments reſpecting the book, and earneſtly recommend it to all thoſe who have a reliſh for ſound doctrine and a taſte for elegant literature.—While the preſs is daily teeming with the frivolous productions of romance, or the more pernicious effuſions of infidelity, we have no doubt there are ſtill many to be found who prefer edification to amuſement, and truth to error, and therefore hope the propoſals will meet with immediate and ſuitable encouragement.

	J. H. LIVINGSTON,	SAM. MILLER,
(Signed)	WM. LINN,	JOHN M'KNIGHT,
	JOHN M. MASON,	G. A. KUYPERS,
	JOHN N. ABEEL,	BENJ. FOSTER,
	JOHN RODGERS,	PHILIP MILLEDOLER.

We the Miniſters of the Goſpel, in Philadelphia, heartily concur with our Brethren of New-York, in the foregoing recommendation.

J. HENRY CH. HELMUTH,	WM. ROGERS,
ASHBEL GREEN,	WM. HENDEL,
WM. MARSHALL,	THOMAS USTICK.
ROBERT ANNAN,	

TO THE FRIENDS OF PURE CHRISTIANITY,

OF EVERY DENOMINATION.

THE FOLLOWING WORK

OF THE

GREAT DOCTOR WITSIUS,

A WORK

CONSPICUOUS FOR

ELEGANCE OF STYLE,

PURITY OF DOCTRINE,

SOLIDITY OF JUDGMENT,

STRENGTH OF REASONING,

CANDOUR OF SENTIMENT,

WARMTH OF ADDRESS,

AND

FERVOUR OF PIETY;

CALCULATED

TO PROMOTE GENUINE CHRISTIANITY,

INSTRUCT THE IGNORANT,

RECLAIM THE ERRONEOUS,

ESTABLISH THE ORTHODOX,

AND

VINDICATE GOSPEL-TRUTH

AGAINST ALL ADVERSARIES WHATEVER,

IS MOST RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED

BY

THE EDITOR.

CONTENTS.

Page

THE *life of the author*, 9

A pacific addreſs to the profeſſors of divinity and miniſters in the United Provinces, 31

OECONOMY OF THE DIVINE COVENANTS.

BOOK I.

CHAP. I.

Of the divine covenants in general, 45

II. *Of the contracting parties in the covenant of works*, 58

III. *Of the law, or condition, of the covenant of works*, 72

IV. *Of the promiſes of the covenant of works*, 83

V. *Of the penal ſanction of the covenant of works*, 104

VI. *Of the ſacraments of the covenant of works*, 137

VII. *Of the firſt Sabbath*, 155

VIII. *Of the violation of the covenant of works on the part of man*, 182

IX. *Of the abrogation of the covenant of works on the part of God.* 206

BOOK II.

CHAP. I.

Page

Introduction to treating on the covenant of grace, 223

II. *Of the compact between the Father and the Son,* 226

III. *The nature of the compact between the Father and the Son, more fully explained,* 243

IV. *Of the person of the Surety,* 265

V. *Of the suretiship and satisfaction of Christ,* 280

VI. *What sufferings of Christ are satisfactory,* 293

VII. *Of the effect of Christ's satisfaction,* 327

VIII. *Of the necessity of Christ's satisfaction,* 343

IX. *Of the persons for whom Christ engaged and satisfied,* 359

X. *After what manner Christ used the sacraments.* 382

BOOK III.

CHAP. I.

Of the covenant of God with the elect, 397

II. *Of the oneness of the covenant of grace, as to its substance,* 411

III. *Of the different œconomies or dispensations of the covenant of grace.* 434

THE

LIFE

OF THE

AUTHOR.

EXTRACTED FROM DR. MARCK'S FUNERAL ORATION ON HIM.

HERMAN WITS (or, as he is commonly called *Witsius*) was descended from reputable parents. His father, *Nicholaus Wits*, was a gentleman universally esteemed by his fellow citizens at *Enkhuysen*, to whom he endeared himself by his fidelity, modesty, justice, benevolence, and unaffected piety in every character he sustained, either in the church or in the city; for in the former he was first a deacon, and afterwards a ruling elder, and treasurer in the latter. His mother was *Joanna*, a gentlewoman of great piety and prudence, the daughter of *Herman Gerhard*; who, after many dangers and distresses, obtained a calm and secure settle-

ment in the church at *Enkhuyſen;* where he preached the goſpel, for upwards of thirty years, with great reputation; and ſuch was the affection he bore to his church, that he rejected the moſt profitable offers that were made to him.

The parents of our WITSIUS, having vowed to devote a child to the miniſtry, did, upon the birth of this ſon, call him after his grandfather, praying that in *Herman* the grandſon, might be revived the ſpirit of the grandfather; and that, endued with equal, if not ſuperior talents, he might imitate his example.

HERMAN WITSIUS was born on the 12th of February, 1636, at *Enkhuyſen*, a town of *Weſt Frieſland;* one of the firſt that threw off the *Spaniſh* yoke, aſſerted their own liberty, and once enlightened with the truths of the goſpel, retained the purity of worſhip ever after, and, in the very worſt times of *Arminianiſm*, continued, above many, ſtedfaſt in the faith. And though it was a place noted for trade and navigation, yet it produced men famous in every branch of literature. So that *Witſius*, even in his native place, had illuſtrious patterns to copy after.

The care which theſe pious parents took of young *Witſius* during his tender infancy, was not intermitted as he began to grow; for, being ſtill mindful of their vow, they brought him up in a very pious manner, inſtructing him in the principles and precepts of religion and Chriſtian piety. In his ſixth year they ſent him to the public ſchool of the town, to learn the rudiments of the *Latin* tongue: from which, after ſpending three years, and being advanced to the higheſt form there, his uncle by the mother, *Peter Gerhard*, took him under his own private and domeſtic tuition; a perſon well ſkilled in *Latin*, *Greek*, *Hebrew*, and philoſophy. But his principal ſtudy had been *Divinity*. This man, then diſen-

gaged from all public buſineſs, and being as fond of his nephew as if he had been his own ſon, taught him with that aſſiduity, that, before he was fifteen, he made no ſmall proficiency in the *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Hebrew*, and acquired ſuch knowledge in logic and other parts of philoſophy, that, when he was afterwards removed to the univerſity, he could ſtudy without a maſter. At the ſame time he learned the ethic compendiums of *Wallæus* and *Burgerſdicius*, with ſo much care, as to be able to repeat moſt of the ſentences, very frequent in *Burgerſdicius*, from the ancients, whether *Greek* or *Latin*. He alſo peruſed his elements of phyſics, and dipped a little into metaphyſical ſubtilties; and committed to memory moſt of the theological definitions and diſtinctions from *Wendelin*. As his uncle was a man of exemplary piety, and was wont to apply almoſt to every common occurrence of life, ſome ſtriking paſſages of both teſtaments, which he often repeated, either in Hebrew or Greek, while riſing, dreſſing, walking, ſtudying, or otherwiſe employed; ſo, by his example and admonitions, he ſtirred up his nephew to the ſame practice. Whence it was, that at thoſe tender years he had rendered familiar to himſelf many entire paſſages of the Hebrew and Greek Teſtament, which he was far from forgetting when more advanced in life.

Being thus formed by a private education, in 1651, and the fifteenth year of his age, it was reſolved to ſend him to ſome univerſity. *Utrecht* was pitched upon, being furniſhed with men very eminent in every branch of literature, with a conſiderable concourſe of ſtudents, and an extraordinary ſtrictneſs of diſcipline. What principally recommended it, were the famous divines, *Giſbert Voetius*, *Charles Maaiſius*, and *John Hoornbeeckius*, all of them great names, and ornaments in their day. Being therefore received into that univerſity, he

was, for metaphyſics, put under the direction of *Paul Voetius*, then profeſſor of philoſophy; and being, moreover, much taken with the ſtudy of the Oriental languages, he cloſely attended on the celebrated *John Leuſden*, who taught thoſe languages with incredible dexterity; and under him he conſtrued almoſt the whole Hebrew text, as alſo the commentaries of *Solomon Iarchi*, *Aben Ezra*, and *Kimchi* on *Hoſea*, and the *Chaldee* paraphraſe of *Jonathan* on *Iſaiah*, and of *Onkelos* on a part of the *Pentateuch*. Moreover, under the ſame maſter, he juſt touched on the myſteries of the *Maſora*, and the barbarous diction of the *Talmud*; namely, the parts publiſhed by *John Cocceius*, under the title of *Sanhedrin* and *Maccoth*, and by *Conſtantine Lempereur*, under that of *Babha Bathra*: under the ſame maſter he learned the elements of the *Syriac* and *Arabic* languages; which laſt, however, he afterwards leſs cultivated than the others. What proficiency he made in the *Hebrew*, appeared from a public ſpecimen he gave, at the inſtigation of *Leuſden*, of a well-written *Hebrew* oration about the *Meſſias* of the *Jews* and *Chriſtians*, in 1654. But though almoſt quite ſwallowed up in thoſe ſtudies, he by no means neglected the ſtudy of divinity, to which he knew all the others were only ſubſervient; but in that ſublime ſcience he diligently uſed, as maſters, the greateſt men, and beſt ſeen in the ſacred ſcriptures, whoſe moſt laudable memory no lapſe of time ſhall ever be able to obliterate; namely, *Giſbert Voetius*, *John Hoornbeeckius*, *Gaulterus Bruinius*, and *Andrew Eſſenius*. By whoſe inſtructions, together with his own extraordinary application, and true piety towards God, what proficiency he made, the reader may eaſily judge for himſelf. However, he had a mind to ſee *Groningen*, to have the benefit of hearing the famous *Samuel Mareſius*: whither he went in 1654, after the

ſummer-vacation; chiefly applying to divinity: under whoſe direction he made exerciſes in *French*, by which he gave ſo much ſatisfaction to this great man, that, notwithſtanding his many avocations, he deigned to correct and purge thoſe declamations of *Witſius* from their ſolecifms and other improprieties, before they were recited in the college. Having thus ſpent a year at *Groningen*, and obtained an honorable teſtimonial from the *theological faculty*, he next turned his thoughts to *Leyden*. But the plague then raging there, he reſolved to return to *Utrecht*, in order to build farther on the foundation he had there ſo happily laid: and, therefore, he not only carefully heard the profeſſors in divinity at this time, as before, both in public and private, but cultivated a peculiar familiarity with the Very Reverend *Juſtus van den Bogaerdt*, whoſe piety, prudence, and admirable endowments he had ſuch a value for, that he imagined, perhaps from youthful inexperience, no preacher equal to him. From his ſermons, converſation, and example, he learned the deeper myſteries of the kingdom of God, and of myſtical and ſpiritual Chriſtianity. From him he underſtood how great the difference is between any ſuperficial knowledge, which ſcholaſtic exerciſes, books learnedly written, and a cloſe application, may procure to minds quite deſtitute of ſanctification; and that heavenly wiſdom, which is acquired by meditation, prayer, love, familiar converſe with God, and by the very reliſh and experience of ſpiritual things; which proceeding from the Spirit of God, internally illuminating, convincing, perſuading, and ſealing, glorioufly tranſforms the whole man into the moſt holy image of Chriſt. In a word, he owned, that by means of this holy perſon he was introduced by the Lord Jeſus to his moſt ſecret receſſes, while, before, he too much and too fondly pleaſed himſelf in tarrying in the porch; and there, at

length, learned, diſclaiming all vain preſumption of ſcience, humbly to ſit down at the feet of the heavenly Maſter, and receive the kingdom of heaven as a little child. But that it may not be thought, he ſo applied to the forming of his mind to piety, as to neglect for the future all academical ſtudies, the *theſes* he wrote on the *Sacred Trinity*, againſt the *Jews*, from their own writings, may, and ought to be, a proof to the contrary; and which he publiſhed in the month of October 1655, to be diſputed under the moderation of the famous *Leuſden;* which, though warmly attacked by the moſt experienced academicians, yet the moderator thought the reſpondent acquitted himſelf ſo well, as to ſuperſede his interpoſition on any account: and when, according to cuſtom, he returned ſolemn thanks to the moderator for his trouble, this laſt very politely and truly made anſwer, He had ſtood in no need of his help.

The time now ſeemed to require, that our *Witſius*, very famous at two univerſities, ſhould be employed in the public ſervice of the church, and firſt, as uſual, give ſpecimens of his proficiency. Therefore, in the month of May 1656, he preſented himſelf at *Enkhuyſen* to a preparatory examination, as it is called, together with his then fellow-ſtudent, *John Laſtdragerus*, with whom he had a familiarity from his youth, and whom he afterwards had for his moſt intimate colleague and faithful fellow-labourer, firſt in the church of *Leovaarden*, and then at *Utrecht*. And upon this occaſion he was not only admitted to preach publicly, which he did with uncommon applauſe, but gave ſo general ſatisfaction, that there was ſcarce a country-church in *North Holland*, where he then reſided, which, wanting a miniſter, did not put his name in the number of the three candidates, from which the election is uſually made. And, at the inſtigation of the Reverend *John James le Bois*, miniſ-

ter of the *French* church at *Utrecht*, he ventured, upon leave given, to preach publicly to the *French* church at *Dort*, in their language. And from that time he often preached in *French*, both at *Utrecht* and *Amſterdam;* as alſo ſometimes in the courſe of his miniſtry at *Leovaarden*. But becauſe he imagined, there was ſtill ſomething wanting to the elegance of his language, he propoſed very ſoon to take a tour to France, and pay his reſpects to the great men there, and at the ſame time have the pleaſure of hearing them, and improving in their language.

But providence diſpoſed otherwiſe; for the following year, 1657, and the twenty-firſt of his age, being lawfully called by the church of *Weſt Wouden*, he was ordained there on the 8th of July. This village lies almoſt in the mid-way between *Enkhuyſen* and *Horn*, and is united with the pariſh of *Bienne Wijſent*. And here, for four years and upwards, he laboured with the greateſt alacrity of a youthful mind; and with no leſs benefit: for, by frequent catechiſing, and with the greateſt prudence ſuiting himſelf to the catechumens, both boys and girls, they, who before were groſsly ignorant, could not only give proper anſwers on the principal heads of our religion, but prove their aſſertions by ſuitable texts of ſcripture, and repeat a whole ſermon diſtinctly, when examined on it, to the joy as well as ſhame of their parents and older people. The reputation of ſo faithful and dextrous a paſtor being thus widely ſpread, the church of *Wormer*, in the ſame tract of *North Holland*, ſufficiently numerous and celebrated, but then too much diſtracted by inteſtine commotions, imagined they could not pitch upon a fitter guide to allay their hearts, and form their minds. This call *Witſius* not only accepted, paſſing to that charge in October 1661, but ſpent there four years and a half, doing every thing in his power to

promote Chriſtian unanimity and the common ſalvation; and as he ſaw the extenſive fruits of his labours among them, ſo he was univerſally beloved. Wherefore he could not bear to remove from them to the people of *Sluys* in *Flanders*, who offered him great encouragement to preach: but the people of *Goeſe* in *Zealand* ſucceeded in their call, and he repaired to them about Whitſuntide 1666, and was ſo acceptable to all by his doctrine, manners, and diligence, as to live there in the moſt agreeable peace and concord with his learned, pious, and vigilant colleagues, two of whom he revered as his fathers; and the third, who was younger, he loved as his brother. He was much delighted with this ſettlement, and often wiſhed to grow old in this peaceful retreat. But the people of *Leovaarden*, in *Weſt Frieſland* interrupted theſe thoughts; who, in November 1667, called him, with a remarkable affection, to that celebrated metropolis of his native country, that he might prove a ſhining light, not only in the church, court, and ſenate of that place, but to all the people of *Frieſland*, who flocked thither from all parts to the aſſembly of the ſtates; but the people of *Goeſe*, doing all they could to hinder his removal, it was April 1668 before he went to *Leovaarden*. And it is ſcarcely to be expreſſed, with what vigilance, fidelity, and prudence he conducted himſelf; even at a time of ſuch difficulty, when the enemy, having made ſuch incurſions into *Holland*, and made themſelves maſters of moſt of its towns, and ſtruck a panic into all, when a man of ſuch ſpirit and reſolution was abſolutely neceſſary. Nor do I know of any before or ſince, whoſe labours were more ſucceſsful, and who was more acceptable to the church, the nobility, and the court. And therefore he was for ſome time tutor to *Henry Caſimir*, the Moſt Serene Prince of *Naſſau*, hereditary governor of *Frieſland*, too untimely ſnatched

away by death; and with remarkable ſucceſs he inſtructed, in the doctrines of religion, his Moſt Illuſtrious ſiſter *Amelia*, a very religious princeſs, afterwards married to the Duke of *Saxe-Eiſenach*; and he preſided at the profeſſion of faith, which both princes publicly made, to the great edification of the church, in the preſence of the Princeſs-mother, *Albertina* of *Orange*.

It is not, therefore, to be wondered, that when, through the injury of the moſt calamitous times, and the deceaſe both of the venerable and aged *Chriſtian Schotanus*, and of *John Melchior Steinbergius*, ſcarce inſtalled in the profeſſorſhip, the theological intereſts of the univerſity of *Franequer* ſeemed to be fallen to decay; and the extraordinary and truly-academical endowments of our *Witſius* were perfectly well known in *Frieſland*, by an experience of ſeven whole years; that, I ſay, he was appointed to the ordinary profeſſion of divinity, in the year 1675, in the academy of his native country, thus happily to be reſtored. Which opportunity alſo the church of *Franequer* prudently laid hold on, being then without a ſecond miniſter, very cheerfully to commit to him, now appointed profeſſor, that ſacred charge. Having, therefore, accepted both theſe calls, he came to *Franequer*; and, after being declared Doctor of Divinity in the academical aſſembly, by the divine his colleague, he was, on the 15th of April, inſtalled profeſſor of the ſame; after delivering a ſolemn oration, with the greateſt applauſe of a concourſe of people from all parts; in which he excellently expreſſed the character of a genuine divine: and as ſuch he ſoon after demeaned himſelf, together with the venerable and aged *Nicolaus Arnoldus*, his moſt intimate colleague.

In the pulpit *Witſius* addreſſed himſelf with ſo much gravity, elegance, piety, ſolidity, and uſefulneſs, that

the general inattention of the people was removed, and religious impreſſions were made both on great and ſmall. The academical chair alſo gained a warmth from his ſacred fire, to which, from the different and moſt diſtant parts of *Europe*, the youth, intended for the miniſtry, reſorted in great numbers. And not to be wanting in his duty, or diſappoint the intention of thoſe who called him, in any particular, he no ſooner entered the univerſity, than, notwithſtanding his many daily public and private labours, in both his offices, he ſet himſelf to write, and in a very little time publiſhed, beſides *Select Academical Diſputations*, moſtly tending to eſtabliſh the peace of the church, and a ſmaller diſſertation, two works pretty large and learned, which went through ſeveral editions, and were ſpread over *Europe;* being every where read with univerſal approbation. And beſides, there was nothing of extraordinary importance to be tranſacted, even with the ſchiſmatic followers of *Labadie*, who had then fixed their principal reſidence in *Weſt Frieſland*, which both the nobility and the overſeers of the church did not think proper ſhould be diſpatched by this man.

About this time Mr. *J. Marck*, on his return from his ſtudies at *Leyden*, commenced his acquaintance with *Witſius*, who recommended him as paſtor to the church of *Midlumen*, between *Franequer* and *Harlingen;* and afterwards procured him the degree of Doctor in Divinity; and, by his intereſt with his Serene Highneſs and others, Dr. *Marck* was appointed third ordinary profeſſor of divinity, in 1676.

But the juſtly-renowned character of our *Witſius* was ſuch, that others, envying the happineſs of the people of *Frieſland*, wanted to have the benefit of his labours themſelves. This was firſt attempted by the overſeers of the univerſity of *Groningen*, who to procure a worthy

ſucceſſor to the deceaſed *James Altingius*, as well in the theological and philological chairs, as in the univerſity-church, about the cloſe of the year 1679, ſent to *Franequer* a reverend perſon, to offer the moſt honorable terms, in order to prevail on *Witſius*. But that attempt proved unſucceſsful. For, communicating the affair to his Serene Highneſs the Prince, and the other overſeers of the univerſity, they proteſted his ſervices were moſt acceptable to them, and he excuſed himſelf in a handſome manner to the people of *Groningen*. But thoſe of *Utrecht* very ſoon followed the example of *Groningen*, in the beginning of the year 1680; when, upon the deceaſe of the celebrated *Burman*, they judged it neceſſary to have a great man, to add to the reputation of their univerſity, and to maintain the ancient piety of their church; and being well aſſured, that none was fitter for all thoſe purpoſes than *Witſius*, who was formerly one of their own ſtudents, they therefore diſpatched a ſplendid deputation to *Franequer*, to entreat him to come and be an ornament in their univerſity, and church, to which he conſented with little difficulty, notwithſtanding the oppoſition made by thoſe of *Frieſland*, who were loath to part with one who had been ſo uſeful among them; for his obligations to the univerſity of *Utrecht* were ſuch, that he thought he could not ſhew his gratitude more, than by accepting of their invitation. Accordingly, after a moſt honorable diſmiſſion from the afflicted *Frieſlanders*, he came to *Utrecht*, and was admitted into the miniſtry of that church, on the 25th of April, and, four days after, into the profeſſorſhip of the univerſity, after delivering a moſt elegant oration on the excellence of evangelical truth, which fully anſwered univerſal expectation. And it can ſcarce be expreſſed, how happily he lived in credit, and laboured above full eighteen years of his moſt valuable life, with theſe celebrated men, *Pe-*

ter *Maeſtricht*, *Melchior Leydeckerus*, and *Hermannus*, then *Halenius*, after the example of the doctors, his predeceſſors, whom he always had in the higheſt veneration. In the miniſtry he had ſeveral colleagues, men of learning, piety, peace, and zeal for God; among whom were his ancient colleagues in the church of *Leovaarden*, *Peter Eindhovius*, and *John Laſtdragerus*. In the univerſity, beſides the forementioned divines, he had not only his own *John Leuſden*, an excellent philologiſt, but *Gerard de Vries*, and *John Luitſius*, famous philoſophers, who, for the benefit of the church, prepared the youth intended for the miniſtry. Before his pulpit he had a Chriſtian magiſtracy, and the whole body of the people, who admired and experienced the power of his elocution, their minds being variouſly affected with religious impreſſions. Before his academical and private chair, he had not only a large circle of promiſing youths from all parts of the world, who admired his moſt learned, ſolid, prudent, and eloquent diſſertations; but doctors themſelves daily reſorted in great numbers to learn of him. And therefore he declined no labour, by which, even at the expence of many reſtleſs nights, he might be of ſervice to the univerſity and church. Nor did he think it ſufficient, by ſermons, lectures, conferences, and diſputations, to produce his uſeful and various ſtock of learning, but he expoſed his treaſures to the whole world, preſent and to come, in many public and excellent writings to laſt for ever, and never to decay, but with the utter extinction of ſolid learning and true piety itſelf. And to the commendation of the people of *Utrecht* be it ſpoken, that, not only in eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies, they always acknowledged his abilities and prudence, ſeaſonably calling him to the higheſt dignities in ſynods; but even the nobility, both by deeds and words, teſtified, that his endowments were perfectly well known

to, and highly eſteemed by them. And therefore they honored him twice with the badges of the higheſt office in their univerſity, in 1686 and in 1697. And we muſt by no means omit, that when, in 1685, a moſt ſplendid embaſſy of the whole United Provinces was decreed to be ſent to JAMES King of Great Britain, afterwards unhappily drawn aſide and ruined by the deceitful arts of the French and Romiſh party; which embaſſy was executed by the moſt illuſtrious *Waſſenaar*, Lord of *Duvenvorden*, and the ordinary ambaſſador, his Excellency *Citters*, with the Moſt Noble and Illuſtrious *Weed*, Lord of *Dykveld*; that, I ſay, this laſt eaſily perſuaded his colleagues of legation to employ none but *Witſius* for their chaplain; a divine, whom, to the honor of the *Dutch* churches, they might preſent in perſon to the *Engliſh* nation, without any apprehenſion either of offence or contempt. Nor was *Witſius* himſelf againſt the reſolution of theſe illuſtrious perſonages; for he went cheerfully, though indiſpoſed in body; and, on his return in a few months after, owned, that having converſed with the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, the Biſhop of London, and with many other divines, both Epiſcopal and Diſſenters in diſcipline, he obſerved not a few things, which made an increaſe to his ſtock of learning, and by which he was better qualified to act prudently on all future occaſions. And the Engliſh from that time owned, that being thus better acquainted with *Witſius*, he ever after juſtly deſerved their regard and applauſe.

The reputation of *Witſius*, thus ſpread all over the world, made the moſt illuſtrious overſeers of the univerſity of *Leyden*, with the burgomaſters, reſolve to give a call to this great man, in 1698; in order to make up the loſs which was apprehended from the deceaſe of the great *Spanhemius*, which ſeemed to be drawing near. And this reſolution was approved of by our gracious Stadt-

holder, WILLIAM III. King of *Great Britain*, of immortal memory, from that conſtant piety he entertained towards God, and that equal fidelity and prudence he exerciſed towards our church and univerſity. Nor was there the leaſt delay either in determining or executing that call to the profeſſorſhip of divinity, or in his accepting thereof. For though the people of *Utrecht* could have wiſhed otherwiſe, yet our *Witſius* had ſeveral weighty reaſons why he thought it his duty to comply with the *Leyden* invitation; judging it was entirely for the intereſt of the church, equally as for his own, that, hereafter exempted from the labours of the pulpit, he might, with the greater freedom, devote the reſt of his aged life to the benefit of the univerſity; but eſpecially, as he was made acquainted with his Majeſty's pleaſure, by the illuſtrious Penſioner *Heinſius*. And when his Majeſty admitted him into his royal preſence, he ſignified the ſatisfaction he had with his accepting the call to the chair of *Leyden*. He entered on his office the 16th of October, after delivering a very grave and elegant oration, in which he gave the character of the *Modeſt Divine*. And with what fidelity he diſcharged this office for the ſpace of ten years: with what aſſiduity he laboured; with what wiſdom and prudence he taught; with what elegance he ſpoke; with what alacrity he diſcourſed in diſputations; with what piety he lived; with what ſweetneſs of temper he demeaned himſelf; with what gracefulneſs he continued to write; with what luſtre he adorned the univerſity; are things ſo well known to all, as may ſuperſede any particular enlargement.

But he had ſcarce paſſed a year at *Leyden*, when the High and Mighty States of *Holland* and *Weſt Frieſland* did, on the recommendation of the overſeers of the univerſity, in the room of *Mark Effius*, the piouſly-deceaſed inſpector of their theological college, in which inge-

nious youths of the republic are reared for the ſervice of the church, commit the ſuperintendancy thereof to our *Witſius*, as the mildeſt tutor they could employ for their pupils; without detriment to all the honor and dignity of his profeſſorſhip, which he enjoyed in conjunction with the celebrated *Anthony Hulſius*. When he was inſtalled in this new office, the illuſtrious preſident of the ſupreme court of *Holland*, and overſeer of the univerſity, *Hubert Rooſenboomius* Lord of *Sgrevelſrecht* did, in a moſt elegant *Latin* diſcourſe, in the name of all the nobility, not only ſet forth the praiſes of the new inſpector, but alſo exhorted all the members of that college to a due veneration for him, and to ſhew him all other becoming marks of reſpect. *Witſius* accepted, but with reluctance, this new province; for had he not judged a ſubmiſſion to the will of the ſtates, and his laying himſelf out for the ſervice of the church, to be his duty, he would not have complied with it. However, he executed this great charge with the greateſt fidelity and care, for the advantage of, and with an affection for his pupils, equally with that of his profeſſorſhip in the univerſity; till, in the year 1707, on the 8th of February, on account of his advanced age, and growing infirmities, he, with great modeſty, in the aſſembly of the overſeers and burgomaſters, notwithſtanding all their remonſtrances and entreaties to the contrary, both in public and private, and all the great emoluments ariſing therefrom to himſelf, reſigned this other office; being at the ſame time alſo diſcharged, at his own deſire, from the public exerciſes of his profeſſorſhip in the univerſity; for executing which in the old manner his ſtrength of body was ſcarce any longer ſufficient: the vigour of his mind continued ſtill unaltered; but, as he often declared, he had much rather deſiſt from the work, than flag in it.

And it is not to be thought, that *Wilfius* would have been equal to ſo many and great labours, and the church and univerſity have enjoyed ſo many and ſo great benefits by him, had he not found at home the moſt powerful cordials and ſupports; particularly in the choiceſt and moſt beloved of wives, *Aletta van Borkhorn*, the daughter of *Weſſel van Borkhorn*, a citizen and merchant of good character, at *Utrecht*, and a worthy elder of the church, and of *Martina van Yſen*; whom he married in the middle of the ſummer of 1660, after three years ſpent in the ſacred miniſtry. She was eminent for meekneſs, and every civil and religious virtue; ſhe loved and honored her huſband, in a manner above the common; with whom he lived in the greateſt harmony and complacency, about four and twenty years, in *North Holland*, *Zealand*, *Frieſland*, and at *Utrecht*; at length, in the year 1684, after many great and long infirmities of body, ſhe was taken from him by a truly-Chriſtian death. He was no leſs happy in his offspring, eſpecially in three ſurviving daughters, *Martina*, *Joanna*, and *Petronella*, who were endued with every accompliſhment that can adorn the ſex, but eſpecially in their duty and affection to their father, which they ſhewed not only before, but more eſpecially after the death of their mother.

From what has been ſaid, may ſufficiently appear, the admirable endowments and virtues of this man. How great was the force of his genius, in apprehending, inveſtigating, and illuſtrating, even the moſt abſtruſe ſubjects; the accuracy of his judgment, in diſtinguiſhing, determining, and arranging them; the tenacity of his memory, in retaining and recollecting them; what readineſs of the moſt charming eloquence, in explaining, inculcating, and urging them home; were well known to thoſe who ever ſaw or heard him. Nor was his graceſulneſs in a Latin ſtyle, as is moſt apparent from all he

wrote and ſaid, leſs than his readineſs in the Dutch; in which, diſcourſing from the pulpit, with a peculiar decency of geſture and voice, he raviſhed the minds of the faithful to a holy aſſent, and unbelievers and the vicious themſelves he filled with aſtoniſhment, ſhame, and terror. And as none will be found, from reading his funeral diſcourſe, to have with more dignity commended the deceaſed Q. *Mary*, ſo his many ſacred poems muſt have affected a mind ſo learned and ſo pious. There was no branch of learning, neceſſary to adorn a divine, in which he did not greatly excel. He ſo increaſed his knowledge of philoſophy, when at the univerſity, that none of the quirks or ſophiſms of infidels could inſnare him, nor any artifice induce him to make ſhipwreck of the faith, or embrace or encourage any of the errors of the times. He was maſter of the whole compaſs of ſacred philology, *Greek* and *Hebrew*: he was well acquainted with the elegancies of profane literature, *Latin*, *Greek*, and *Oriental*; ſkilfully borrowing from thence whatever might ſerve to explain, in a becoming manner, the ſacred ſcriptures; prudently avoiding every extreme. He was perfectly well ſkilled in hiſtory, both ancient and modern, eccleſiaſtical and civil, Jewiſh and Chriſtian, domeſtic and foreign: and from it he always ſelected, with the greateſt care, what might principally be of preſent uſe. He thoroughly learned divinity in all its branches, being as expert in the confirmation and vindication of doctrines, and in ſhewing their connection, as in confuting errors, diſcovering their origin, and diſtinguiſhing their importance. Above all, he was in love with, revered, and commended the holy ſcriptures; as that from which alone true wiſdom is to be derived; and which, by long practice, he had rendered ſo very familiar to himſelf, as not only to have the original words,

upon all occaſions, very readily at command, but to be able directly, without heſitation, to explain the moſt difficult. Nor did he, in this caſe, reſt on any man's authority; moſt rightly judging ſuch a conduct to be inconſiſtent with the divine glory of the Chriſtian faith, declaring and demeaning himſelf the moſt obſequious diſciple of the Holy Spirit alone. Hence he had neither a diſdain for old, and an itch for new things; nor an averſion to new, and a mad and indolent fondneſs for old things. He would neither be conſtrained by others, nor conſtrain any one himſelf; being taught neither to follow, nor to form a party. That golden ſaying pleaſed him much: *Unanimity in things neceſſary; liberty in things not neceſſary; and in all things, prudence and charity;* which he profeſſed was his common creed. Nor can we have the leaſt doubt of his zeal for the *faith once delivered to the ſaints*, and for true piety towards God, which he expreſſed in his writings, when at *Leovaarden* and *Franequer*, againſt ſome dangerous opinions, then ſtarting up both in divinity and philoſophy: of which alſo he gave a proof at *Utrecht* and *Leyden*, when publicly teſtifying in writing, that he could not bear the authority of reaſon to be ſo extolled above ſcripture, as that this laſt ſhould be entirely ſubject to its command, or be overturned by ludicrous interpretations. His zeal, in his latter days, was greatly inflamed, when he obſerved all eccleſiaſtical diſcipline againſt thoſe who would overthrow the Chriſtian faith, and even right reaſon itſelf, publicly trampled upon under the moſt idle pretences, and every thing almoſt given up to a depraved reaſon, to the ſubverting the foundations of Chriſtianity; while ſome indeed mourned in ſecret, but were forced to be ſilent; and therefore he declared his joy at his approaching diſſolution, on account of the evils he foreſaw were hanging over the church; and of-

ten called on thoſe who ſhould ſurvive, to tremble when the adverſary was triumphing over the doctrines of ſalvation, and all true piety, to the deſtruction both of church and ſtate; and that by men, whom it leaſt became, and who ſtill artfully diſſembled a regard for religion, and for eccleſiaſtical and civil conſtitutions; unleſs God, in his wonderful providence, averted the calamity, and more powerfully ſtirred up the zeal of our ſuperiors, againſt *Atheiſm*, *Pelagianiſm*, and the ſeeds of both. I don't ſpeak of thoſe ſmaller differences, obſervable for ſome time paſt, in the method of ranging theological matters, in ſome modes of expreſſion. All are well apprized with what equity and moderation *Witſius* ever treated theſe differences in opinion; and if ever any was inclined to unanimity and concord with real brethren, he was the man, who never did any thing to interrupt it; but every thing either to eſtabliſh or reſtore it, and to remove all ſeeds of diſſenſion. This is what that genuine chriſtianity he had imbibed, prompted him to; and what the ſingular meekneſs of his temper inſpired; by which he was ready to give way to the raſhly-angry, and either made no anſwer to injurious railers, or repaid them even with thoſe ample encomiums, which, in other reſpects, they might deſerve. Thus lived our venerable *Witſius*, giving uneaſineſs to none, but the greateſt pleaſure to all, with whom he had any connection, and was not eaſily exceeded by any in offices of humanity and brotherly love. There was at the ſame time in him a certain wonderful conjunction of religious and civil prudence, conſummated and confirmed by long experience, with an unfeigned candour. Neither was any equal to him for diligence in the duties of his office, being always moſt ready to do every thing, by which he could be ſerviceable to the flocks and pupils under his care, for the benefit of the church. He did not with-

draw from them in old age itſelf, nor during his indiſpoſition indulge himſelf too much. His modeſty was quite ſingular, by which he not only always behaved with that deep concern in treating the holy ſcriptures and its myſteries; but alſo, by which he ſcarce ever pleaſed himſelf in the things he moſt happily wrote and ſaid: and when his beſt friends juſtly commended his performances, he even ſuſpected their ſincerity. Nor could any under adverſities be more content with his lot, even publicly declaring at *Utrecht*, that he would not exchange his place in the univerſity and church, either with the royal or imperial dignity. And to omit other virtues, or rather in the compaſs of one to comprize all; he was not in appearance, but in reality, *a true divine*, ever diſcovering his heavenly wiſdom by a ſincere piety towards God and his Saviour. For he was conſtant in the public acts of worſhip, unwearied in the domeſtic exerciſes of piety, giving, in this, an example for the imitation of others in the fear of the Lord, inceſſantly taken up in heavenly meditation, and continued inſtant in prayer, both ſtated and ejaculatory; and ſhone in them, when under the dictates and impulſes of the Holy Spirit. In fine, his chief care was, by avoiding evil and doing good, to demean himſelf both towards God and man, as became one who had obtained redemption through Chriſt, and, by divine grace, the hope of a bleſſed eternity in heaven; which he conſtantly panted after, with the utmoſt contempt for the things in the world.

His writings are numerous, learned, and uſeful. In 1660, almoſt at his entrance on the miniſtry, he publiſhed his *Judæus Chriſtianizans*, on the principles of faith, and on the Holy Trinity. When at *Wormer*, he put out in Low Dutch, 1665, *The Practice of Chriſtianity*, with the ſpiritual characters of the unregenerate, with reſpect to what is commendable in them; and of

the regenerate, as to what is blameable and wants correction. At *Leovaarden*, he gave alſo in Low Dutch, *The Lord's controverſy with his vineyard*, and, at the ſame time, briſkly defended it againſt opponents. Of his *Franequer* labours, we have, beſides ſmaller works, afterwards compriſed in larger volumes, his *Oeconomia fœderum Dei cum hominibus*, tranſlated into Low Dutch by *Harlingius*; and his *Exercitationes ſacræ in ſymbolum apoſtolorum*, tranſlated alſo into Low Dutch, by *Coſterus*. At *Utrecht*, came out his *Exercitationes ſacræ in orationem Dominicam*; his *Egyptiaca* and *Decaphylon* with a diſſertation on the *Legio fulminatrix Chriſtianorum*, and the firſt volume of his *Miſcellanea Sacra*, and a good deal of the ſecond; beſides ſome ſmaller works alſo. And at *Leyden*, he publiſhed at laſt the ſecond volume of his *Miſcellanea Sacra* complete: and at this laſt place he ſet on foot what he calls his *Meletemata Leydenſia*, to be occaſionally enlarged with a number of ſelect diſſertations. Indeed, all theſe writings are juſtly in great repute, their ſtyle being polite, the ſubjects uſeful, and the whole repleniſhed with various branches of learning, and a beautiful ſtrain of piety, all which may deſervedly commend them to the lateſt poſterity.

He had been often, formerly, afflicted with racking and painful diſeaſes; whence, ſometimes, aroſe the greater apprehenſion of a far earlier departure by death. And nothing, under divine providence, but his vigour of mind, joined to his piety, could have preſerved him ſo long to the world; and that with ſo perfect an uſe of his ſenſes, that, not long before his death, he could read, without heſitation, the ſmalleſt Greek characters by moon-light, which none beſides himſelf could do. But, with his advanced years, he ſometimes had cruel fits of the gout, and ſtone in the kidneys; and once in the chair, in the midſt of a lecture, a ſlight touch of an

apoplexy. Theſe diſorders were, indeed, mitigated by the ſkill of the famous Dr. *Frederic Deckers*; but now and then, by ſlight attacks, threatened a return: for his wavering and languiſhing ſtate of health, indicating the paſt diſorders not to be entirely extirpated, gave apprehenſions of a future fatal diſtemper; which was occaſioned by the ſudden attack of a fever on the evening of the 18th of October. This fever, though very ſoon removed, left his body exceeding weak, and his mind in a ſtate of lethargy, an indication that his head was affected. The good man himſelf, conſidering theſe ſymptoms, with great conſtancy and calmneſs of mind, told the phyſician, and his other friends then preſent, that they could not fail to prove mortal. Nor did the ſlightneſs of the diſeaſe make any change in his opinion as to its fatal iſſue, while he foreſaw, that the conſequences of an advanced age, and of the greateſt weakneſs, could admit of no other event. Nor indeed without cauſe: for his ſenſes were gradually weakened by repeated ſlumbers; however, about his laſt hour he ſenſibly ſignified to Dr. *Marck* who attended him, his bleſſed hope, and his heavenly deſires, as he had frequently done before; and then about noon, on the 22d of October 1708, he ſweetly departed this life, in the 73d year of his age, and entered into the joy of his Lord.

A

PACIFIC ADDRESS

TO

The very Reverend, renowned, and celebrated Profeſſors of Divinity in the univerſities of the United Provinces, and Paſtors of the Reformed Churches, the zealous Defenders of the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

OUR lot is caſt in thoſe days, in which the world is almoſt weary, and the church certainly groans under the weight of books. With the latter it was never better, than when wrapping herſelf up in the pure ſimplicity of faith and love, and without any itch for diſputing, ſhe depended on the word of the Lord alone, and drew the pure and undefiled truth from thoſe writings only, which both made David *wiſer than all his teachers*, and are *able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furniſhed to every good work.* But it is now-a-days extremely difficult to write ſo as to pleaſe. For ſo great is every where the fruitfulneſs of true learning or the vain imagination of ſcience, ſo obſtinate the attachment to once-received hypotheſis, ſo briſk the ſtudy of particular parts, and ſo malevolent the judgment paſſed on other mens works, which even affect the minds of good men reluctantly,

that whoever imagines by his writing to ſatisfy either thoſe delicate perſons, or thoſe addicted to more than one ſide in the orthodox faith, ſeems both to attribute too much to his own capacity, and to be ignorant of the diſpoſition of the times. Since the former of theſe cannot be charged upon me by reaſon of the ſlenderneſs of my abilities; and the latter cannot at all be hid from a perſon who has been converſant in the world; it ſeems to be very proper for me to aſſign the reaſons of my again appearing in public, and to ſhew the purpoſe and deſign of the work which I now offer to the churches of my native country.

And to whom ſhould I render theſe reaſons, rather than to you, *Reverend and Learned Gentlemen*, who are intereſted in theſe matters, who are the moſt proper of all to judge of them, and to whom, next to God and my own conſcience, I chiefly deſire to approve my ſtudies. Above all I ſincerely declare, that it was not an incurable itch of writing, a raging thirſt after vain-glory, a cankered or envious diſpoſition of mind, a deteſtable deſire of widening the wounds already made in the churches, the odious pleaſure of blackening any one's character, expoſing right ſentiments, or miſrepreſenting any one's opinion, nor, laſtly, an infamous deſire to ſow, increaſe, or continue ſtrifes, which have occaſioned my writing at this time. For, as I diſclaim all theſe reaſons, ſo the whole deſign of this work, though but ſlightly glanced at, will acquit me from theſe charges.

To ſee however the minds of the godly diſturbed by the inconſiderate aſſertions of ſome, and their uncommon interpretations of the ſcriptures, or the ſuſpicions of others, not at all times dictated by charity, perhaps not by prudence, gave me indeed the greateſt concern. And foraſmuch as the doctrine of the covenant of grace, in which the manner of the reconciliation of ſinners to

God is ſhewn, and the manifold diſpenſation of that covenant, have been the unhappy object of contention in the Netherlands; ſo that whatever points are now the ſubject of diſpute (if you except the new method of interpreting the prophecies, and the opinions of the modern philoſophy, which have been introduced with a bad deſign into divinity) may and ought to be referred to this; I have thought this ſubject in the firſt place challenged my attention. But this I have undertaken to treat in ſuch a manner, that both the truth which hath been handed down to and believed in the churches, might be preſerved in entire ſafety, and in defending it nothing might be ſaid favouring of pride or ſeverity, or againſt the laws of charity. This reaſon induces me not to dwell upon bare diſputations, which are generally unprofitable, and, if not ſeaſoned with a certain degree of acrimony or ſalt, are quite deſtitute of every elegance and embelliſhment.

I have choſen to enter on this ſubject from its very beginning; and have endeavoured, as far as I could, to explain it methodically and clearly, every where throwing light on the obſcurer paſſages of ſcripture, anxiouſly ſearching the import of the phraſes uſed by the Holy Spirit, and referring the whole to the practice of faith and godlineſs, and to the glory of God in Chriſt, that my expoſition might be more uſeful and inſtructive. As nothing was more profitable and delightful to me than this ſtudy, ſo nothing more forcibly and certainly convinces the minds of men, than a clear and ſober demonſtration of the truth to the conſcience; which, proceeding by pleaſant ſteps, beginning with plain and acknowledged truths, and connecting its aſſertions in a continued chain, gradually leads to the more abſtruſe points, and forces an aſſent to them, not leſs ſtrongly than to thoſe which

command our ſuffrage at the firſt view; in the mean while by its ſecret efficacy gliding into the inmoſt parts of the ſoul, and fixing it with a certain aſtoniſhment on the contemplation of the admirable perfections of God.

It was neceſſary, however, ſometimes to oppoſe different opinions, as the ſubject led me; either the public adverſaries of the reformed churches, chiefly the Socinians and Remonſtrants, who, by their daring comments, have defiled the doctrines of God's covenants; or ſome of our brethren, who have taken it into their heads to form hypotheſes different from thoſe that have been received, and lay them as the foundation of almoſt all divinity. Malice itſelf cannot, I imagine, deny, that I have every where treated them with candour and modeſty. I have ſtated the controverſy juſtly, have fixed upon no man any opinion which he ought not to acknowledge for his own; and have uſed ſuch arguments as had before ſatisfied my own conſcience. And if theſe were not ſolid and convincing of themſelves, I could not think any ſtrength could be added to them by the fervor and vehemence of the diſputer. Above all I thought cautious procedure neceſſary, in the examination of the opinions of my brethren. To this buſineſs I never applied myſelf with an intention to ſearch after any inaccurate word, harſh phraſe, or crude expreſſion, on which to exerciſe a critical talent. Let thoſe be ſo employed, whom Gregory Nazianzen ſtyled *the flatterers of names;* but I thought I would be more uſefully occupied, in examining how far all the orthodox agree, and how the more improper modes of expreſſion might be ſoftened by others more accurate; and there at laſt fixing, where there is a real diverſity of ſentiments; and thoſe, I dare promiſe myſelf, will be found fewer, and of leſs importance, provided alienation of mind be out of the queſtion. Yet I cannot paſs over ſome uncouth expreſſions,

foreign interpretations, and contradictory positions. In certain places I detect the danger attending some of them, but without disparagement of the teacher, and without a malignant dispositon. For I confess I agree with those, who believe that the doctrine of the covenants has long since been delivered in the churches on so sure a foundation, as to stand in no need of new hypotheses; in which I could not find that solidity or utility, which could warrant an endeavour to support them as points of theology.

That observation concerning the threefold dispensation of the covenant of grace, is not of such importance; the *first* under the promise, wherein mere grace and liberty prevailed, without the yoke, or the burden of an accusing law; the *second* under the law, when the Old Testament commenced, subjecting the faithful to the dominion of angels, and the fear of death all their lives, and last of all to the curse and execration, mean time not allowing to the fathers true and permanent blessings; the *third* under the gospel, when the godly began to be set at liberty from the dominion of angels, from the fear of temporal death, and the curse, which an exact observance of the ceremonial law carried with it, and at last enjoyed true and lasting blessings, the circumcision of the heart, the writing of the law in the mind, the full and true remission of sins, the Spirit of adoption, and such like things: this observation, I say, is not of such importance as to be insisted on in so many academical lectures, so many pulpit discourses, and in such a number of books published as well in Latin as our native tongues, as though the whole substance of theological learning consisted in it. For I have shewn in the following work, that these doctrines, however they be explained, are horrible to be mentioned, that they are

founded on corrupt interpretations, and cannot be defended without wresting the scriptures.

But I esteem to be no less dangerous the opinions of a man otherwise very learned, who denies that a covenant of works was made with Adam; and will scarce allow that under the name of death, with which he was threatened in case he sinned, a corporal death is to be comprehended; and denies that spiritual and heavenly bliss, such as we now obtain through Christ, was promised to Adam on condition of perfect obedience; and, by a musty distinction, dividing the sufferings of Christ into warlike and judiciary, affirms that the latter only, or, as they sometimes soften the expression, chiefly, were satisfactory, excluding thence the sorrows he endured in the garden, and the condemnatory sentence he received both in the Jewish council, and from the Roman governor, the stripes with which his body was wounded, his being nailed to the cursed cross, and last of all his death itself. On these points I have spoke my mind freely and candidly, as becomes *a defender of sound doctrine, and an opposer of novel opinions*; with which honorable character the sixth œcumenical council, which met at Constantinople, honored the Emperor Constantine IV. and which ought not to be foreign to men of our order.

I have also now and then made remarks on some things of less moment, which yet did not seem either to have a solid scriptural interpretation, or are less accurately conceived of. Nor has this enquiry been without profit. Amphilochius is commended by Basil on this account, because he thought, that *no word which is any way used concerning God, should be passed over without a careful inquiry into its meaning.* But I have done this without rancour or malice; *not to reprove the authors, but that the studious readers might be benefited, by having their*

errors pointed out ; as I remember Polybius somewhere expresses himself. And I hope it will not be taken ill by the learned and ingenious, to whom I willingly grant the same liberty I take, if (to use nearly the same words in which Augustine declared his dissent from Cyprian) while *I cannot reach their reputation, acknowledge my writings to be inferior to many of theirs, love their genius, am delighted with their sayings, and admire their virtues ; yet I cannot receive that in which they are otherwise minded, with that liberty to which the Lord hath called us.* Especially when they see that I have willingly adopted, and with no small praise recommended to the reader, what things have been ingeniously invented by them, what they have happily found out by searching into the original languages, have learnedly recovered from the relics of hitherto unknown antiquity, have judiciously confirmed, or clearly explained.

They will also find, that wherever I thought they spoke truth, though unjustly defamed by others, I have sometimes cordially defended them, and have wiped off the stamp of absurdity and novelty fixed upon them ; and this so frequently and solicitously, that without doubt some will think I have gone to excess in these matters. Yet I cannot bring my mind to repent of this ingenuous dealing. For how could any one have done otherwise, who not being attached to any faction, not enslaved to human authority, not pleasing his own or others passions, is a votary to truth alone, and regards not what any person says, but what is said ? He who loves the peace of Jerusalem, had rather see controversies determined than multiplied ; and will with pleasure learn, that several things are harmless, or even useful, which by others are invidiously dragged into the subject of litigation.

All judicious men are juſtly diſpleaſed with that petulance of wit which prevails at this day, raſhly aiming to overturn wiſe and agreeable inventions by dogmatical attacks, anon inſolently breaking out into a bold, and often ludicrous interpretation of ſecret prophecies, ridiculouſly haling into the roll of prophecies, what contains nothing but the precepts of our common faith and holineſs: by which means the reſpectable public and our ſacred functions are not a little diſcredited. Nor is it indeed matter of wonder, if the warmer zeal of ſome has painted this wantonneſs as it deſerves, or perhaps in too ſtrong colours. But yet a medium is to be obſerved in all things: and I do not approve the endeavours of ſome, who, whilſt they treat of our differences, enumerate not only ſome decades, but even centuries of controverſies, ſometimes with cruel eloquence expreſſing their rage at ſome innocent points. Whether this method of diſputing greatly conduces to the promoting of ſaving knowledge, and the edification of ſouls, I will not now ſay: but this I know, that by this means a pleaſure is done to the enemies of the church, who will ſecretly rejoice in their boſom, that there are not fewer, and, if they may be judged of by the heat of the combatants, not leſs unimportant diſputes among us, than among them. And this not very ſecretly neither; for they do not, nor will ever ceaſe to caſt this reproach upon us; which, O grief! may be much eaſier ſaid than refuted.

O how much better and dutiful would it be to uſe all our pains and concern to leſſen, make up, and, if poſſible, put an end to all controverſies! To this, Reverend and learned Gentlemen, apply all your counſels and ſtudies. This all the godly who mourn for the breaches in Joſeph; this the churches which are committed to your care; this Jesus himſelf, the King

of truth and peace, require and expect from you; this they beg, they obteſt, they beſeech you for. *If therefore there be any conſolation in Chriſt, if any comfort of love, if any fellowſhip of the Spirit, if any bowels and mercies, fulfil ye my joy, fulfil ye the joy of all ſaints, fulfil ye the joy of our Lord Jeſus himſelf, that ye may be like minded, having the ſame love, being of one accord, of one mind.* There have been enough of quarrels, ſlanders, and ſuſpicions; enough of contentions among brethren, which, I engage for it, will afford no juſt cauſe of triumph; enough of inteſtine diviſions, by which we deſtroy one another; and more than enough of paſſion. Let party-zeal, a thirſt after pre-eminence, and ſchiſmatical diſtinctions, be for ever henceforth baniſhed from among us. Let all litigious, ſatirical, and virulent writings be blotted out; whoſe deſign is only to revive the fires of conſuming queſtions. If we write any thing relating to thoſe queſtions, let us lay aſide all paſſions, as hindrances to us in our inquiries, and reſtraints on the judges. Let us fight with arguments, not with railings, bearing in mind this ſaying of Ariſtophanes, *It does not become men to rail at poets as bread-ſellers.* How much leſs does it become divines? Let not the pure ſtream of divinity, to be fetched from the ſole fountain of ſacred learning, be defiled with any of the impure waters of either the ancient or modern philoſophy. Let us abſtain from harſh and unuſual expreſſions, from crude and raſh aſſertions; from whence ariſe *envy, ſtrife, railings, evil ſurmiſings.* Let the inſtruments of both covenants be indeed diligently handled by all, but with a degree of ſacred fear and trembling. Let none pleaſe himſelf with new gloſſes and commentaries, becauſe he ſuppoſes them to be modern and unknown to his predeceſſors. Let him who thinks he has found out ſomething preferable to and more ſolid

than received opinions, offer it to the public with modesty, without vilifying his brethren; without asserting or determining rashly, submitting his thoughts to the censure of the learned, and the judgment of the church; not immediately forcing them on the common people to the distraction of their minds, nor hastily offering them to uncautious youth, who are improper judges of such weighty matters. And let none reject, on account of its novelty solely, what is agreeable to the meaning of the words, to scripture-phrases, to the analogy of faith, or to the relation the text bears to others. Cajetan, who is commended by our Chamier, has not badly expressed himself on this head. *If at any time a new sense agreeable to the text offers itself, though different from the current of divines, let the reader shew himself an impartial judge.* And in another place he says, *Let none abhor a new sense of sacred writ, because it differs from that of the ancient doctors; for God hath not confined the expounding of the sacred scriptures to the glosses of the ancient teachers.* Let the depths of prophecy be also diligently searched into; but reverently, without wresting the words of God, without violating that inclosure by which God has debarred poor mortals from the sight of his secrets, which are seldom explained any otherwise than by the event; lest he who searches into the majesty, should be overwhelmed by the glory.

Let no one, by the authority of any man's name, bind the free consciences of the faithful; but, as Clemens Romanus once said, *Let the meaning of truth be taken from the scriptures themselves:* by these alone let it stand or fall in religious matters: by these let all controversies be settled: *Let the sacred and undefiled gospel of Christ our God be laid as the foundation,* as was wont to be done in the godly councils of the ancients. Nevertheless, let not any one stubbornly on this pretence

withhold his aſſent to ſuch forms, which are taken from the word of God, are agreeable to the ſcriptures, are the bonds of church union, the teſts of orthodoxy, bars againſt hereſies, and the limits of wanton wits; as if they were the relics of the Babyloniſh tower, by which, through a human device, not to be approved of, men were obliged to think and ſpeak alike in religion.

Let no man appoint a guide for himſelf out of the modern divines, all whoſe dictates he is to receive and defend as heavenly oracles; in whom is riſen up *a teacher and light of the world*, as the ancients celebrated Baſil, and in compariſon of whoſe ſtature all others appear as little children and dwarfs, as if they were nothing but pigmies void of underſtanding; when he himſelf perhaps proteſts, that he would not be reckoned the author of any thing new in divinity, and ſo the head of a ſect. On the other hand, let no one deſpiſe ſuch a man, as if nothing true or good, and uſeful to the underſtanding of the ſcriptures, could proceed from him: for God gives to no perſon a pious diſpoſition, to meditate on the ſcriptures day and night, without opening to him the treaſures of his pure wiſdom.

Let us extol the bleſſings of our heavenly Father in whomſoever we find them; congratulate the church for them; and convert them each of us to our own advantage. Let no one who expounds the orthodox ſentiments of his mind generally in eloquent language, be reckoned criminal on account of an improper word, or harſh expreſſion, which might fall from one handling another ſubject: for poiſon does not lie hid in ſyllables; nor does truth conſiſt in ſound, but in the intention; nor godlineſs in the tinkling of braſs, but in the meaning of the things ſignified. Yet let us all endeavour to expreſs ourſelves as accurately as poſſible; and by no

means defend what has been imprudently ſaid either by our friends or ourſelves, leſt we take it ill to be reprehended by others; but rather, through the perſuaſion of ingenuity, the order of truth, the importunity of charity, and the applauſe of all good men, let us paſs by, cancel, or correct any miſtakes; which great men, both in old times, and in our days, have done, to their very great honor. Let the ſevere brand of hereſy be ſuddenly ſtamped upon none, on account of what is ſuppoſed to follow from his words, while he does not admit the conſequence, but deteſts it. Let mens ſolid learning, their peaceable diſpoſition, and a careful diſcharge of their duty without noiſe and diſturbance, procure them much more favor, than the inconſiderate heat of boiling zeal, and the efforts of a headſtrong temper, as Homer ſays, and a mind eager for the combat, which, however the cauſe of God may be a pretext of, are aimed at only for our own glory and advantage.

Let ſome liberty alſo be given to learned men in explaining paſſages of ſcripture, in the choice of arguments in defence of the common truth, in the uſe of phraſes and terms, in reſolving queſtions commonly called problematic (for, amidſt the preſent darkneſs of mens minds, it is not to be expected, that all men ſhould in all things ſpeak and think alike;) but let this liberty be confined within the bounds of modeſty, prudence, and love; leſt it ſhould degenerate into petulant licentiouſneſs, and turn our Zion into a Babel.

Theſe, *Reverend and Reſpected Brethren*, are my earneſt wiſhes and counſels, which I recommend to your prudence, faith, and piety; as I do yourſelves and your ſacred labours, to the grace of the great God and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who can make you perfect in every good work, to do his will, working in you that which is well pleaſing in his ſight; and at laſt, after you have

happily fought the good fight of faith, can bleſs you with an everlaſting crown of glory This was long ſince, and is now, the moſt earneſt wiſh of,

Reverend and Reſpected Brethren,
Your Fellow-labourer, and
Servant in the Lord,

Herman Witſius.

Utrecht, *Oct.* 20,
1693.

THE

OECONOMY

OF THE

DIVINE COVENANTS.

BOOK I.

CHAPTER I.

Of the Divine Covenants in general.

WHOEVER intends to diſcourſe on the ſubject of the *divine covenants*, by which eternal ſalvation is adjudged to man, on certain conditions worthy of God and the rational creature, ought principally to endeavour, that he may treat theſe heavenly oracles in a ſacred and pure manner; and, neither through raſhneſs nor paſſion, intermingle any thing, which he is not firmly perſuaded is contained in thoſe records, which exhibit the copies of theſe covenants to us. For if Zaleucus preſcribed it as a condition to the contentious interpreters of his laws, "That both parties ſhould explain the meaning of the lawgiver, in the aſſembly of the thouſand men, with halters hanging about the necks of each; and that whatever party ſhould appear to wreſt the ſenſe of the law to the detriment thereof, ſhould, in the preſence of the thouſand, end their lives by a halter;" as Polybius, a very

grave author, relates :* If the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt, disputing about their temple, were obliged to plead their cause before the king and his courtiers, on this condition only, that "the advocates of whatever party that were foiled, should be punished with death," as Josephus relates ;† he must certainly be in greater danger, and liable to sorer destruction, who shall, by a rash wresting, pervert the sacred mysteries of the divine covenants ; while our Lord openly declares, that *whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven.*‡ It is not therefore without a kind of sacred awe that I begin this work ; praying God, that, laying aside every prejudice, I may shew myself a tractable disciple of the holy writings, and may, with modesty, impart to my brethren, what I think I have learned from them : if happily this my poor performance may serve to lessen disputes, and clear up the truth ; than which nothing should be deemed by us of greater importance.

II. Because it is by words, especially the words of those languages, in which God has been pleased to reveal his sacred mysteries to men, that we can, with success, arrive at the knowledge of things ; it will be worth while, more accurately to inquire into the import both of the Hebrew word BERITH, and the Greek DIATHEKE, which the Holy Spirit makes use of on this subject. And first, we are to give the etymology, and then the different significations of the Hebrew word. With respect to the former, the learned are not agreed. There are some who derive it from the root BARA, which in *Piel* signifies to *cut down ;* because, as we shall presently observe, covenants used to be solemnly ratified by cutting animals asunder. It may also be derived from

* Lib. xii. c. 7. † Antiq. l. xiii. c. 6. ‡ Matth. vi. 19.

the ſame root in a very different ſignification. For as BARA properly ſignifies to *create*, ſo metaphorically to *ordain* or (DIATITHESTHAI) to *diſpoſe*. Whence it happened, that the Helleniſt Jews uſed TO KTIZEIN in the ſame ſignification. Certainly in this ſenſe Peter* calls EXOUSIA, *power* appointed by men, and for human purpoſes, ANTHROPINE KTISIS, *the ordinance of man*. Which too the famous Grotius appears to have learnedly obſerved on the title of the New Teſtament. Others had rather derive it from BARAH as SHEBITH from SHABAH, ſignifying, among other things, to *chuſe*. And in covenants, eſpecially of friendſhip, there is a choice of perſons, between whom, of things about which, and of conditions upon which, a covenant is entered into. Nor is this improperly obſerved.

III. But BERITH is uſed in the holy ſcriptures in different ſignifications; ſometimes *improperly*, and ſometimes *properly*. *Improperly*, it denotes the following things. 1. An immutable ordinance about any thing. In this ſenſe God mentions *his covenant of the day, and of the night*;† that is, that fixed ordinance about the uninterrupted viciſſitude of day and night, which‡ is called CHOOK, that is, *ſtatute limited* or *fixed*, to which nothing ought to be added, or taken from it. In this ſenſe is included the notion of a *teſtament*, or of a laſt and irrevocable will. Thus God ſaid,§ *I have given thee, and thy ſons and thy daughters with thee*, LECHAK NGOOLAM BERITH MÆLACH NGOOLAM HIV, *by a ſtatute for ever; it is a covenant of ſalt for ever*. This obſervation is of uſe for the more fully underſtanding the nature of the covenant of grace, which the apoſtle propoſes under the ſimilitude of a teſtament, the execution of which depends upon the death of the teſtator.‖ To

* 1 Pet. ii. 13. † Jer. xxxiii. 20. ‡ Chap. xxxi. 36.
§ Numb. xviii. 19. ‖ Heb. ix. 15, 16, 17.

which notion both the Hebrew BERITH, and the Greek, DIATHEKE, may lead us. 2. A ſure and ſtable *promiſe*, though it be not mutual: HINNEH ANOCHI CORETH BERITH. *Behold, I make a covenant; before all thy people I will do marvels.** *This is my covenant with them; my Spirit ſhall not depart from them.*† 3. It ſignifies alſo a *precept*; and to *cut a covenant* is to *give a precept: I made a covenant with your fathers—ſaying, At the end of ſeven years let ye go every man his brother.*‡ Hence it appears in what ſenſe the *decalogue* is called *God's covenant.* But *properly*, it ſignifies *a mutual agreement between parties with reſpect to ſomething.* Such a covenant took place between Abraham and Mamre, with Eſchol and Ener, who are called BANGALE BERITH, ABRAM, *confederates with Abraham.*§ Such alſo was that between Iſaac and Abimelech;‖ between Jonathan and David.¶ And of this kind likewiſe is that of which we are now to treat, between God and man.

IV. No leſs equivocal is the DIATHEKE of the Greeks; which, both ſingularly and plurally, very often denotes a *teſtament*; as Budæus** ſhews from Iſocrates, Æſchines, Demoſthenes, and others. In this ſenſe, we hinted, it was uſed by the apoſtle.†† Sometimes alſo it denotes a *law*, which is a rule of life. For the Orphici and Pythagoreans ſtyled the rules of living preſcribed to their pupils, DIATHEKAI, according to Grotius. It alſo frequently ſignifies an *engagement* and *agreement*; wherefore Heſychius explains it by SUNOMOSIA, *confederacy.* There is none of theſe ſignifications that will not be of uſe in the progreſs of the work.

V. To make a covenant the Hebrews call BERITH BEROTH, *to ſtrike a covenant*, in the ſame manner as the

* Exod. xxxiv. 10. † Iſ. lix. 21. ‡ Jer. xxxiv. 13. 14. § Gen. xiv. 13. ‖ Gen. xxvi. 28, 29. ¶ 1 Sam. xviii. 2. ** In comment. ling. Græc. †† Heb. ix. 15.

Greeks and Latins, *ferire*, *icere*, *percutere fœdus*. Which doubtleſs took its riſe from the ancient ceremony of ſlaying animals, by which covenants were ratified. Of this rite we obſerve very ancient traces;* whether this was then firſt commanded by God, or borrowed from the cuſtom of nations. Emphatical is what Polybius† relates of the Cynæthenſes, EPI TON SPHAGION TOUS ORKOUS KAI TAS PISTEIS EDIDOSAN ALLELOIS, *Over the ſlaughtered victims they took a ſolemn oath, and plighted faith to each other.* Which phraſe is plainly ſimilar to what God uſes,‡ CORETHE BERITHI NGALE DSABACH, *thoſe that have made a covenant with me by ſacrifice.* They alſo uſed to *paſs in the middle* between the divided parts of the victim cut aſunder.§ Whoever wants to know more about this rite, may conſult Grotius on Matth. xxvi. 28. Bochart in his Hierozoicon, book ii. chap. xxxiii. p. 325, and Owen's Theologum. book iii. chap. 1. It was likewiſe a cuſtom, that agreements and contracts were ratified, by adhibiting ſolemn *feaſts*. Examples of this are obvious in ſcripture. Thus it is ſaid, that Iſaac, having made a covenant with Abimelech, made a great feaſt, and eat with them.‖ In like manner acted his ſon Jacob, after having made a covenant with Laban.¶ There is mention of a like federal feaſt, 2 Sam. iii. 20. where a relation is given of the feaſt which David made for Abner and his attendants, who came to make a covenant with him in the name of the people. That it was alſo cuſtomary among the Heathens, the moſt learned Stuckius ſhews.**

VI. Nor were theſe rites without their ſignificancy. The *cutting* the animals *aſunder* denoted, that in the

* Gen. xv. 9, 10. † Lib. iv. p. (mihi) 398. ‡ Pſal. l. 5. § Jer. xxxiv. 18. ‖ Gen. xxvi. 30. ¶ Gen. xxxi. 54. ** In Antiq. Convival. l. i. c. 40.

ſame manner the perjured and covenant-breaker ſhould be cut aſunder, by the vengeance of God. To this purpoſe is what God ſays,* *I will give the men that have tranſgreſſed my covenant, which have not performed the words of the covenant which they had made before me, when they cut the calf in twain, and paſſed between the parts thereof—I will give them into the hand of their enemies;—and their dead bodies ſhall be for meat unto the fowls of the heaven, and to the beaſts of the earth.* Compare 1 Sam. xi. 7. An ancient form of theſe execrations is extant in Livy.† "The Roman people do not firſt fail in theſe conditions: if they ſhould, through public reſolution or baſe deceit, do thou, O Jupiter, on that day, thus ſtrike the Roman people, as I do now this hog; and ſtrike ſo much the heavier, as thou art ſtronger and more powerful." When the convenanters paſſed thro' the *parts cut aſunder*, it was intimated, that they were united by the cloſeſt bond of religion and an oath, and now formed one body, as Vatablus‡ has remarked. *Federal feaſts* were tokens of a ſincere and laſting friendſhip.

VII. But when God, in the ſolemnities of his covenants with men, thought proper to uſe theſe or the like rites, the ſignificancy was much more auguſt. They who made covenant with God by ſacrifice, not only ſubjected themſelves to puniſhment, if, impiouſly revolting from God, they ſlighted his covenant; but God likewiſe intimated to them, that all the ſtability of the covenant of grace was founded on the ſacrifice of Chriſt, and that the body and ſoul of Chriſt were one day to be pulled aſunder. *All the promiſes of God in him are yea, and in him Amen.*§ His blood is *the blood of the New Teſtament*,‖ in a far more excellent manner, than that with which Moſes ſprinkled both the altar and the co-

* Jer. xxxiv. 18. 19, 20. † Lib. 1. ‡ Ad Gen. xv. 10.
§ 2 Cor. i. 20. ‖ Matth. xxvi. 28.

venanted people.* Thoſe ſacred banquets, with which the covenanted were entertained before the face of the Lord, eſpecially that which the Lord Jeſus hath inſtituted under the New Teſtament, do moſt effectually ſeal that intimate communion and fellowſhip that is between Chriſt and believers.

VIII. There are very learned men, who from this rite would draw the explication of that phraſe, which we have Num. xviii. 19, and 2 Chron. xiii. 5. of *a covenant of ſalt*, that is, of a covenant of friendſhip, and that ſtable and perpetual. "Which ſeems to be ſo denominated, becauſe ſalt was uſually made uſe of in ſacrifices, to denote that the covenant was made ſure upon obſerving the cuſtomary rites in making it," ſays the celebrated Rivet.† Unleſs we would rather ſuppoſe, that a regard is here had to the firm conſiſtence of ſalt, by which it reſiſts putrefaction and corruption, and in a manner tends to eternity. For that reaſon, Lot's wife is thought to have been turned into a pillar of ſalt; not ſo much, as Auguſtine remarks, *to be as a ſeaſoning to us*, but to ſtand as a laſting and perpetual monument of the divine judgment. For all ſalt is not ſubject to melting. Pliny tells us, that the Arabs build ſome walls and houſes with blocks of ſalt, and cement them with water.

IX. Having premiſed theſe things in general about the terms, let us now enquire into the thing itſelf, and the nature of the covenant of God with man: which I thus define. *A covenant of God with man is an agreement between God and man, about the method of obtaining conſummate happineſs, with the addition of a threatening of eternal deſtruction, with which the deſpiſer of the happineſs offered in that way is to be puniſhed.*

* Exod. xxiv. 8. † In Gen. exercit. 136.

X. The covenant on God's part comprises three things in the whole. 1. *A promise* of consummate happiness in eternal life. 2. *A designation* and *prescription of the condition*, on the performance of which, man acquires a right to the promise. 3. *A penal sanction* against those who do not stand by the prescribed condition. All these things regard the whole man, or HOLOKLEKOS, according to Paul's phrase, as consisting of soul and body. To each part God promises happiness, of each he requires sanctification, and to each he threatens destruction. And he makes this covenant, to the end that God may appear glorious in the whole man.

XI. To enter into such a covenant with a rational creature, formed after his own image, is entirely becoming God, and worthy of him. For it was impossible, but God should propose himself to the intelligent creature as a *pattern* of holiness, in conformity to which he ought to form himself and all his actions, carefully preserving, and always rendering active that original righteousness, with which, from his very origin, he was presented by God. God cannot but bind man to love, worship, and seek him, as the chief good. And it cannot be conceived, how God requiring man to love and seek him, should refuse to be found by man loving, seeking, and esteeming him as the chief good, and as such longing, hungering, and thirsting for him alone. Who can conceive it to be worthy of God, to say to man, I am willing that you seek me alone; but on condition you never find me? I am willing to be earnestly longed for by thee above all things, with hungering and thirsting after me, but on condition you never be satisfied with me? Nor does the justice of God less require, that man rejecting the happiness, offered on the most equitable terms, should be punished with the privation of it, and besides incur the severest indignation of the despised De-

ity. Whence it appears, that, from the very consideration of the divine perfections, it may be fairly deduced, that he has prescribed a certain *law* to man, and that as *the condition of enjoying happiness;* which consists in the fruition of God, enforced with the *threatening of a curse* against the rebel. In which we have just now said, that the whole of the covenant consists. But of each of these there will be fuller room to discourse hereafter.

XII. Hitherto we have considered the covenant of God, as that of one party. It becomes the covenant of two parties, when man consents thereto, *embracing the good* promised by God, *engaging to an exact observance of the condition* required, and, upon the *violation* thereof, voluntarily owning himself obnoxious to the threatened *curse*. This the scripture calls, LENGABRECHA BIBERITH JEHOVAH, *to enter into covenant with the Lord;** *to enter into a curse and an oath.*† In this curse (Paul‡ calls it HOMOLOGIA, *professed subjection)* conscience presents itself a witness, that God's stipulation is just, and that this method of coming to the enjoyment of God highly becomes God, and that there is no other way of obtaining the promise. Whence the evils which God threatens to the transgressors of the covenant, are called *the curses of the covenant*,§ to which the person covenanting voluntarily subjected himself. The effect of this curse on the man, who stands not to the covenant, is called *the vengeance of the covenant.*‖ We have a form of a stipulation or acceptance, Psal. xxvii. 8. *For thee*, i. e. in thy place or stead, *my heart saith, Seek ye my face; thy face, Lord, will I seek.* Where the voluntary stipulation of the believing heart answers to the stipulation made, in the name of God, by conscience his minister.

* Deut. xxix. 12. † Neh. x. 29. ‡ 2 Cor. ix. 13.
§ Deut. xxix. 20. ‖ Lev. xxvi. 25.

XIII. Man, upon the propoſal of this covenant, could not, without guilt, refuſe this aſtipulation. 1. In virtue of the law, which univerſally binds him, humbly to embrace every thing propoſed by God; to whom it is of the eſſence of the rational creature to be ſubject in every reſpect. 2. On account of the high excellency of God, whoſe province it is to diſpoſe of his own benefits, and fix the condition of enjoying them, with ſupreme authority: and at the ſame time to enjoin man, to ſtrive for the poſſeſſion of the bleſſings offered, on the condition preſcribed. Whence this covenant, as taking place between parties very unequal, aſſumes the nature of thoſe engagements, which the Greeks called PROSTAGMATA, or, SUNTHEKAI EK TON EPITAGMATON, *injunctions*, or *covenants from commands*; of which Grotius ſpeaks.* Hence it is that Paul tranſlates the words of Moſes, *Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you*, thus,† TOUTO TO HAIMA TES DIATHEKES, HES ENETEILATO PROS HUMAS HO THEOS. *This is the blood of the teſtament, which God hath enjoined unto you.*‡ It is not left arbitrary to man, to accept or reject, at his pleaſure, God's covenant. Man is commanded to embrace it, breathing after the promiſes, in the way pointed out by the covenant. Not to deſire the *promiſes*, is to refuſe the *goodneſs* of God; to reject the *precepts*, is to deny the *ſovereignty* and *holineſs* of God. Not to ſubmit to the *ſanction*, is to deny the *juſtice* of God. Therefore the apoſtle ſays of God's covenant, that NENOMOTHETETAI, it is *reduced to the form of a law*,§ by which man is obliged to an acceptance. 3. It follows from that love, which man naturally owes to himſelf, and by which he is carried to the chief good; for enjoying of

* De jure bellis et pacis, cap. xv. § 6. † Exod. xxiv. 8.
‡ Heb. ix. 20. § Heb. viii. 6.

which there remains no method beſides the condition preſcribed by God. 4. The very conſcience of man dictates, that this covenant is in all its parts highly equitable. For what can be conceived even by thought more reaſonable, than that man, eſteeming God as his chief good, ſhould ſeek to be delighted in him, and rejoice at the offer of that good? that he ſhould readily receive the law, which is a tranſcript or copy of the divine holineſs, as the rule of his nature and actions? in fine, that he ſhould ſubmit his guilty head to the moſt juſt vengeance of the Deity, if he ſhould happen to make light of this promiſe, and violate the law? From which it follows, that man was not at liberty to reject God's covenant.

XIV. God by this covenant acquires no new right over man: which, if we rightly conſider the matter, neither is nor can be founded on any benefit of God, or miſdemeanor of man, as Arminius argues: nor in any thing without God; the principal or alone foundation of it being the ſovereign majeſty of the moſt high God. Becauſe God is the *bleſſed*, and moſt ſufficient for all felicity, therefore he is alſo the *only Potentate*, as Paul joins theſe two together.* Nor can God's power and right over the creatures, be derived from or increaſed by any thing extrinſic to God. This ought to be deemed unworthy of God's ſovereignty and independence: of which we ſhall ſoon treat more fully. Only God, in this covenant, ſhews what right he has over man. But man, accepting the covenant, and performing the condition, by theſe performances acquire ſome right to demand of God the promiſe. For God has, by his promiſes, generouſly made himſelf a debtor to man. Or, to ſpeak in a manner more becoming God, he has been

* 1 Tim. vi. 15.

pleaſed to make his performing his promiſes, a debt due to himſelf, to his goodneſs, juſtice, and veracity. And to man in covenant, and continuing ſtedfaſt therein, he has granted the right of expecting and requiring, that God ſhould ſatisfy his goodneſs, juſtice, and truth, by the performance of his promiſes. And thus man conſenting to the covenant, *makes God ſay, that he will be a God to him.** That is, liberty is given to him to glory in God, as his God, and to expect from God, that he will become to man in covenant with him, what he is to himſelf, a ſpring of conſummate happineſs.

XV. We find two covenants of God with man in ſcripture: *the covenant of works*, otherwiſe called *the covenant of nature*, or *the legal*; and *the covenant of grace*. So the apoſtle teaches us to diſtinguiſh, Rom. iii. 27, where he mentions *the law of works*, and *the law of faith*: by *the law of works* underſtanding that doctrine, which points out the way, in which, by means of works, ſalvation is obtained; and by *the law of faith*, that doctrine which ſhews the way, in which, by means of faith, ſalvation is obtained. The form of the covenant of works is, *The man which doth thoſe things, ſhall live by them.*† That of the covenant of grace is, *Whoſoever believeth in him, ſhall not be aſhamed.*‡ Theſe covenants agree in this; 1. That, in both, *the contracting parties are the ſame*, God and man. 2. In both, *the ſame promiſe* of eternal life, conſiſting in the immediate fruition of God. 3. The *condition* of both is the *ſame*, perfect obedience to the law preſcribed. For it is not worthy of God to admit man to a bleſſed communion with him, but in the way of untainted holineſs. 4. In both is *the ſame end*, the glory of the moſt undefiled holineſs of God. But they differ in the following reſpects. 1. The *character*

* Deut. xxvi. 17. † Rom. x. 5. ‡ Ibid. ver. 11.

or *relation* of God and man in *the covenant of works*, is different from that in *the covenant of grace*. In the former God acts as *the supreme lawgiver*, and *the chief good*, rejoicing to communicate his happiness to his *innocent creature*. In the latter, as *infinitely merciful*, adjudging life to the elect sinner agreeably to his wisdom and justice. 2. In the covenant of works there was *no mediator*. The covenant of grace has *a mediator*, *Christ*. 3. In the covenant of works, the *condition* of perfect obedience was required, *to be performed by man himself in covenant*. In the covenant of grace, the same condition is proposed, as *to be performed* or *already performed by a Mediator*. And in this substitution of the person consists the principal and essential difference of the covenants. 4. In the covenant of works, man is considered as *working*, and the reward as to be given *of debt*; and consequently man's *glorying* is not excluded, by which as a faithful servant he may glory upon the right discharge of his duty, and demand the reward promised to his work. In the covenant of grace, the man in covenant, ungodly in himself, is considered as *believing*; eternal life being given to man, as the merit of the Mediator, *out of free grace*, which excludes all boasting, except that by which the believing sinner glories in God, as a merciful Saviour. 5. In the covenant of works, something is required of man, *as a condition*, which being performed entitles him to the reward. The covenant of grace, with respect to us, consists of the pure promises of God, in which the Mediator, the life to be obtained by him, the faith by which we may be made partakers of him, and of the benefits purchased by him, and perseverance in that faith, in a word, the whole of salvation, with all things necessary to it, are absolutely promised. 6. The *special end* of the cove-

nant of works, was the manifeſtation of the *holineſs, goodneſs*, and *juſtice* of God, ſhining forth in the moſt perfect *law*, in the moſt liberal *promiſe*, and in the *recompenſe* of reward to be given to thoſe who heartily ſeek him. The *ſpecial end* of the covenant of grace, is *the praiſe of the glory of his grace*,* and the revelation of his unſearchable and *manifold wiſdom:* which perfections of God ſhine forth with a ſplendid luſtre in the gift of a Mediator, by whom complete ſalvation is brought to the ſinner, without tarniſhing the honor of the holineſs, juſtice, and truth of God. To this may be added a demonſtration of the divine *all-ſufficiency*, by which not only man, but, what is more ſurprizing, even a ſinner, may be, and is actually brought to God. All theſe things will be more fully and clearly explained in what follows.

* Eph. i. 6.

CHAP. II.

Of the contracting parties in the covenant of works.

WE begin with the conſideration of *the covenant of works;* which is otherwiſe called *of the law*, and *of nature*, becauſe it is preſcribed by *the law*, requires *works* as the condition, and is founded upon and coeval with *nature*. This covenant is, *An agreement between God and Adam, formed after the image of God, as the head and chief of all mankind, by which God promiſed eternal life and happineſs to him, if he yielded the moſt perfect obedience to all his commands; ſubjoining a threatening of death, if he tranſgreſſed in the leaſt point; and Adam*

accepted this condition. To this purpoſe are theſe two ſentences, afterwards inculcated on the repetition of the law, Lev. xviii. 5. and Deut. xxvii. 26.

II. That theſe things may be the better underſtood, theſe four things are to be explained. 1. *The contracting parties.* 2. *The condition preſcribed in the covenant.* 3. *The promiſes.* 4. *The threatening.*

III. The *contracting parties here* are God and Adam. *God*, as *Sovereign* and *ſupreme Lord*, preſcribing with abſolute power what he judges equitable; as *good himſelf*, or *the chief good*, promiſing communion with himſelf, in which man's principal happineſs lies, to him being obedient, and *doing what is well pleaſing to him:* as *ſelf-righteous*, or *ſovereignly juſt*, threatening death to the rebel. *Adam* ſuſtained a twofold relation. 1. As *man.* 2. As *the head and repreſentative of mankind.* In the former relation he was a rational creature, *under the law* to God, upright, created after the image of God, and furniſhed with ſufficient powers to fulfil all righteouſneſs. All theſe things are preſuppoſed in man, to render him a fit object for God to enter into covenant with.

IV. Man therefore juſt dropt from the hands of his Creator, had a ſoul illuminated with rays of divine light, and adorned with the brighteſt wiſdom; whereby he was not only perfectly maſter of the nature of created things, but delighted himſelf in the contemplation of the ſupreme and uncreated truth, having the eyes of his underſtanding continually directed to the perfections of his God; from the conſideration of which he gathered, by the moſt diſcreet reaſoning, what was juſt and equitable, what worthy of God and of himſelf. To this was added the pureſt *holineſs of will*, acquieſcing in God as the ſupreme truth, revering him as the moſt dread majeſty, loving him as the chief and only good, and, for the ſake

of him, holding dear whatever his mind divinely taught dictated to him to be acceptable, like to, and expreſſive of his perfections, in fine, whatever contributed to the acquiring an intimate and immediate union with him; delighting in the fellowſhip of his God, which was now allowed him; panting after further communion, raiſing himſelf thereto by the creatures, as ſo many ſteps; and finally, celebrating the moſt unſpotted holineſs of God as the moſt perfect tranſcript of him, according to which he was to ſtrive with his utmoſt might to frame himſelf and his actions as exactly as poſſible. This is, as Elihu emphatically expreſſed it, *to delight himſelf with God*, or *to will with God.** This was attended with a moſt regular temperature of the whole *body*, all whoſe members, as inſtruments of righteouſneſs, preſented themſelves ready and alert at the intimation of his holy will. For it did not become the Deity to form a rational creature for any other purpoſe than his own glory. This no rational creature, but what is wiſe and holy, could either perceive or celebrate, as ſhining in the other works of God. If it was deſtitute of this light, and deprived of this endowment, what could it have proved but the reproach of its creator, and moſt unfit to anſwer the end of his creation? All theſe particulars the wiſeſt of kings has expreſſed with the moſt ſtriking ſimplicity, *Lo, this only have I found, that God has made man upright.*†

V. What I have juſt ſaid of the wiſdom of the firſt man, ought, I think, to be extended ſo far, as that, in the ſtate of innocence, the myſtery of the *Trinity* was not unknown to him. For it is, above all things, neceſſary for the perfection of the human underſtanding, to be well acquainted with what it ought to know and believe, concerning its God. And it may be juſtly doubt-

* Job xxxiv. 9. † Eccl. vii. 29.

ed, whether he does not worſhip a God entirely unknown, nay, whether he at all worſhips the true God, who does not know and worſhip him, as ſubſiſting in three perſons. He who repreſents God to himſelf in any other light, repreſents not God to himſelf, but a phantom and idol of his own brain. Epiphanius* ſeems to have had this argument in view, when he thus wrote of Adam: "He was no idolater; for he knew God the Father, and the Son, and Holy Spirit. And he was a prophet, and knew that the Father ſaid to the Son, Let us make man."

VI. Theſe words furniſh a new argument. For ſince God, in the work of creation, manifeſted himſelf three, *the Father made the world by the Son*;† *the Holy Spirit* cheriſhed the waters by brooding upon them; and ſo the whole Trinity, by mutual conſultation, addreſſed themſelves to the creation of man; it is not credible that the Trinity was entirely unknown to the firſt man; unleſs we can ſuppoſe him ignorant of his Creator, who verily was both the Son and the Holy Spirit. It cannot certainly be without deſign, that the ſcripture, when ſpeaking of man's Creator, ſo often uſes the plural number, as If. liv. 5. KI BONGALAICH NGOSAICH, which literally ſignifies, *thy huſbands thy makers.* Pſal. cxlix. 2. ISMACH ISRAEL BENGOSAV, *Let Iſrael rejoice in his Makers.* Nay, he requires man to attend to this, and engrave it on his mind, Eccl. xii. 1. UDSECHOR ÆTH BORÆCHÀ, *Remember thy Creators.* It is criminal when man neglects it, and ſays not, AJEH ÆLOAH NGOSAI, *Where is God my Makers?* Job xxxv. 10. Which phraſes, unleſs they be referred to a Trinity of perſons, might appear to be dangerous. But it is abſurd to ſuppoſe Adam ignorant concerning his Creator, of that which God does not ſuffer his poſterity to be ignorant

* In Panario, p. 9. † Heb. i. 2.

of at this time; and this the rather, that God created man for this end, to be the herald of his being and perfections in the new world. But it undoubtedly tends to the glory of God, that he ſhould particularly celebrate, not only the perfections of God, but alſo how they diſplay themſelves in the diſtinct perſons of the Deity, and in the manner and order of their operation. Excellently to this purpoſe ſpeaks Baſil of Seleucia:* "You take particular notice of this expreſſion, *Let us make man.* Again, this word uſed plurally hints at the perſons of the Godhead, and preſents a Trinity to our knowledge. *The knowledge of it therefore is coeval with the creation.* Nor ſhould it ſeem ſtrange, that afterwards it ſhould be taught; ſince *it is one of thoſe things, of which mention was made in the very firſt creation.*"

VII. I confeſs, Adam could not, from the ſole contemplation of nature, diſcover this myſtery without revelation. But this I am fully perſuaded of, that God revealed ſome things to man, which nature did not dictate of herſelf. For whence did he know the command about the tree of knowledge, and whence the meaning of the tree of life, but by God's declaring it to him? whence the knowledge of ſuch a creation of his wife, as to pronounce her fleſh of his fleſh, and bone of his bone, but from divine revelation? Seeing then God hath revealed to man many things, and thoſe indeed not of ſuch importance, why ſhould we believe that he concealed from him that very thing, the knowledge of which was eminently conducive to the perfection of man, and the honor of God? Therefore a learned man did not think rightly, who inſiſts, that the knowledge of the Trinity *exceeded the happineſs of Adam's ſtate, which was merely natural.* For it was not ſo merely natural, as if Adam knew nothing but

* Serm. ii.

what the conſideration of nature only could ſuggeſt. The contrary we have juſt ſhewn. And it muſt be deemed to have been natural to that ſtate, that man being upright, and enjoying familar converſe with his God, ſhould learn from his own mouth what might render him fitter to celebrate his praiſes. The very learned Zanchius* obſerves, that moſt of the fathers were of that opinion, that Adam, being ſuch and ſo great a friend of God before his fall, ſeveral times ſaw God in a bodily appearance, and heard him ſpeak. He adds, But this was "always the Son of God." And a little after, "Chriſt therefore is that Jehovah, who took Adam and placed him in paradiſe, and ſpoke to him." Thus the ancients believed, that the Son of God did then alſo reveal himſelf to Adam, and converſed with him.

VIII. And this ſaying appears a little too bold: "That the œconomy ſubſiſting between the Three perſons, is ſo principally employed in procuring the ſalvation of the human race, that the knowledge thereof could not belong to the ſtate of innocence, in which there was no place for ſalvation or redemption." For Moſes declares the œconomy of the divine perſons at the very creation. And the goſpel, while it explains that admirable œconomy, as taken up in procuring the ſalvation of mankind, at the ſame time raiſes our thoughts to that œconomy, which was manifeſted in the firſt creation of the world. If now it is profitable and pleaſant for us to think, that the Son of God our Saviour is *the beginning of the creation of God*,† *by whom were created thrones and dominions, things viſible and inviſible, that he might have the pre-eminence in all things*,‡ chief as well in the works of nature as grace; and that the Holy Spirit, now fitting up a new world of grace in our hearts,

* De creat. hom. l. i. c. 1. § 12. † Rev. iii. 14.
‡ Col. i. 16. 18.

did at firſt brood on the waters, and made them pregnant with ſo many noble creatures; and thus to aſcend to the conſideration of the ſame œconomy in the works of creation and nature, which is now revealed to us in the work of ſalvation and grace: who then can refuſe that upright Adam had the ſame knowledge of God in three perſons, though he might be ignorant what each perſon, in his order, was to perform in ſaving ſinners? Add to this, that though, in that ſtate of Adam, there was no room for *redemption*, yet there was for *ſalvation*, and *eternal life*: the ſymbol of which was the tree of life, which even then bore the image of the Son of God. See Rev. ii. 7. For *in him was life*, John i. 4.; which ſymbol had been in vain, if the meaning thereof had been unknown to Adam.

IX. In this rectitude of man principally conſiſts that *image of God*, which the ſcripture ſo often recommends; and which Paul expreſsly places in *knowledge*,* in *righteouſneſs and true holineſs*.† In which places he ſo deſcribes the image of God, which is renewed in us by the Spirit of grace, as at the ſame time to hint, that it is the ſame with that after which man was originally created. And there cannot be different images of God. For as God cannot but be wiſe and holy, and, as ſuch, be a pattern to the rational creature; it follows, that a creature wiſe and holy is the expreſſion of God in theſe his qualities. And it is quite impoſſible, but God muſt own his own likeneſs to conſiſt in this rectitude of the whole man; or acknowledge a fooliſh and perverſe creature to be like him: which would be an open denial of his perfections. It has been prettily obſerved by a very learned man, that HOSIOTES TES ALETHEIAS, *true holineſs*, is not only oppoſed to TE HUPOKRISEI, *hypocriſy* or

* Col. iii. 10. † Eph. iv. 24.

diſſmulation, or TO TE TUPIKE KATHAROTETI, *typical purity*, but that it denotes a *holy ſtudy of truth*, proceeding from the love of God. For HOSIOS, to which anſwers the Hebrew CHAMUD, ſignifies in ſcripture *one ſtudious in and after good.* This HOSIOTES TES ALETHEIAS, *true holineſs*, denotes ſuch a deſire of pleaſing God, as is agreeable to the truth known of and in him, and loved for himſelf.

X. But I ſee no reaſon why the ſame learned perſon ſhould have DIKAIOSUNE, *righteouſneſs*, mentioned by Paul,* to be a privilege peculiar to the covenant of grace, which we obtain in Chriſt, and which Adam had not; meaning by *righteouſneſs* a title to eternal life; which, 'tis owned, Adam was without, as the courſe of his probation was not yet finiſhed. In oppoſition to this aſſertion, I offer the following things to conſideration. 1. There is no neceſſity for underſtanding by *righteouſneſs* a right to eternal life. For that term often denotes a virtue, and a fixed reſolution of giving every one his due; as Eph. v. 9. where the apoſtle, treating of ſanctification, writes, *The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodneſs, and righteouſneſs, and truth.* The learned perſon himſelf obſerved this, who elſewhere† ſpeaks thus: "Righteouſneſs is, firſt, the rectitude of actions, whether of the ſoul or of the members; and their agreement with ſound reaſon; namely, that they may eaſily avoid condemnation or blame, and obtain praiſe. So Tit. iii. 5. *Works of righteouſneſs.* And hence the denomination of juſt or righteous, denotes a blameleſs or praiſe-worthy perſon." Since that word ſignifies elſewhere ſuch a rectitude, why not here too? eſpecially ſince it is indiſputable that ſuch righteouſneſs be-

* Eph. iv. 24. † In Gen. v. § 9.

longed to the image of God in Adam. 2. It ought not to be urged, that *righteouſneſs* here is joined with *holineſs*, and therefore ſo to be diſtinguiſhed from it, as that the *latter* ſhould denote an inherent good quality, and the *former* a right to life. For it may be anſwered, 1*ſt*, That it is no unuſual thing with the Holy Spirit, to expreſs the ſame thing by different words. "It is to be obſerved," ſays Urſinus,* "that righteouſneſs and holineſs in us were the ſame thing before the fall, namely, an inherent conformity to God and the law." Nor does the celebrated Cocceius himſelf refuſe this :† But TZÆDÆK righteouſneſs, if you conſider the law of works ſignifies, in the largeſt ſenſe, every thing that is honeſt, every thing that is true, every thing that is holy." 2*dly*, If we ſhould ſuppoſe that *righteouſneſs* ought to be diſtinguiſhed from *holineſs*, it does not follow that it ought to be diſtinguiſhed in this manner. For there are to be found teſtimonies of this kind, in which no ſuch diſtinction can take place; as Luke i. 74, 75.—*Serve him in* holineſs *and* righteouſneſs *before him:* and 1 Theſſ. ii. 10. *Ye are witneſſes and God alſo, how* holily, *and* juſtly, *and* unblameably *we behaved ourſelves among you that believe.* Add 1 Kings iii. 6.—*He walked before thee in truth, and in righteouſneſs, and in uprightneſs of heart.* Where righteouſneſs, though added to holineſs, can ſignify nothing but a virtue of the ſoul, and the exerciſe of it. 3. If we would abſolutely diſtinguiſh theſe two things, it may be done many ways. (1.) So as to refer *holineſs* to *God*, *righteouſneſs* to *men*. Thus Philo, concerning Abraham, ſays, "Holineſs *is conſidered as towards God;* righteouſneſs *as towards men.*" And the Emperor Marc Antonine‡ ſays of Socrates, "*He was in human things* righteous, *in divine*, holy." (2.) Or

* In queſt. 18. catech. † In Pſal. xv. § 11. ‡ Lib. vii. § 66

ſo as to ſay, that univerſal virtue is denoted by both words; (for even *righteouſneſs* is ſaid of the worſhip of God, Luke i. 75, and *holineſs* is referred to men: Maximus Tyrius* ſays of the ſame Socrates, "Pious *towards God*, holy *towards men*,") but in a different reſpect; ſo as *holineſs* may denote virtue, as it is the love and expreſſion of the divine purity, as Plato explains *holineſs* by the *love of God: Righteouſneſs* indeed may ſignify the ſame virtue, as it is a conformity to the preſcribed rule, and an obedience to the commands of God. *Whether it be* DIKAION, *right* (or righteous) *to hearken unto God.*† (3.) Urſin ſpeaks a little differently.‡ "*Righteouſneſs* and *holineſs* may, in the text of Paul and the catechiſm, be taken for the ſame, or be diſtinguiſhed; as *righteouſneſs* may be underſtood of internal and external actions agreeing with the right judgment of the mind, and with the law of God, and *holineſs* of the qualities." So that there is nothing to conſtrain us to explain *righteouſneſs* here of a right to life: nay, there are many things to perſuade us to the contrary. For, 1. The image of God, even that which is renewed in us by regeneration, conſiſts in abſolute qualities inherent in the ſoul, which are as ſo many reſemblances of the perfections of God: but a right to life is a *mere relation*. 2. The image of God conſiſts in ſomething which is produced in man himſelf, either by the firſt or the new creation. The right to life reſts wholly on the righteouſneſs and merits of Chriſt, which are entirely without us; *Not having my own righteouſneſs.*§ 3. The apoſtle, in the place before us, is not treating of *juſtification*, where this right ſhould have been mentioned; but of *ſanctification*, and the rule thereof, where it was needleſs to ſpeak of that right. 4. They who urge this

* Differt. xxvi. † Acts iv. 19. ‡ Ad. quæſt. 6. catech.
§ Phil. iii. 9.

new explication of righteouſneſs, both ſeem without any juſt cauſe to contradict the catechiſm, queſt. 6. and leſs ſtoutly to oppoſe the Socinians, who maintain that the image of God, after which we are regenerated in Chriſt, is not the ſame with that after which Adam was created. And yet theſe learned men equally with us deteſt this error. Theſe conſiderations make us judge it ſafer to explain righteouſneſs, ſo as to make it a part of the image of God, after which Adam was formed.

XI. But if we take in the whole extent of the image of God, we will ſay it is made up of theſe three parts. 1. *Antecedently*, that it conſiſts in the ſpiritual and immortal nature of the ſoul, and in the faculties of underſtanding and will. 2. *Formally* and principally, in the endowments of the ſoul, righteouſneſs and holineſs. 3. *Conſequentially*, in the immortality of the whole man, and his dominion over the creatures. The firſt of theſe was, as one elegantly expreſſes it, as a precious table, on which the image of God might be drawn and formed: the ſecond, that very image itſelf, and reſemblance of the divinity: the third, the luſtre of that image widely ſpreading its glory, and as rays, which not only adorned the ſoul, but the whole man, and his body, and rendered him the lord and head of the world, and at the ſame time immortal, as being the friend and companion of the eternal God.

XII. The chief ſtrokes of this image Plato ſaw, or certainly heard of, who defines happineſs to be HOMOIOSIS TO THEO, *the reſemblance of God:* and this reſemblance he places in piety, juſtice, and prudence: and what is this but the twofold primary virtue, godlineſs and righteouſneſs, tempered and governed by prudence? His words are excellent, and deſerve to be here tranſcribed. *Tende thneten phuſin, kai tonde ton topon, to kakon parapolei ex anankes, dio kai peiraſthai chre*

enthende ekeiſi pheugein hoti tachiſta : phuge de homoioſis theo, kata to dunaton. Homoioſis de dikaion kai hooſi n meta phroneſeos geneſthai. "This mortal nature, and this inferior place of abode, are neceſſarily ſubject to and encompaſſed with evil. We are therefore to endeavour with the utmoſt expedition to eſcape from it : this flight is an aſſimilation to God as far as may be ; and this aſſimilation is juſtice and piety, accompanied with prudence."*

XIII. God gave to man the charge of this his image, as the moſt excellent depoſit of heaven, and, if kept pure and inviolate, the earneſt of a greater good ; whom for that end he furniſhed with ſufficient powers from his very formation, ſo as to ſtand in no need of further habitual grace. It was only requiſite, that God, by the continual influence of his providence, ſhould preſerve thoſe powers, and excite them to all and each of their acts. For in no ſtate can a creature be, or conceived to be working any thing independently of the Creator. This alſo takes place in the angels themſelves, though they be now confirmed in holineſs and happineſs.

XIV. And thus, indeed, Adam was in covenant with God, as a *man*, created after the image of God, and furniſhed with ſufficient abilities to preſerve that image. There is another relation, in which he was conſidered as the *head* and *repreſentative of mankind*, both *federal* and *natural*. So that God ſaid to Adam, as once to the Iſraelites, *Neither with you only do I make this covenant and this oath, but alſo with thoſe that are not here with us this day.*† The whole hiſtory of the firſt man evinces, that he was not looked upon as an individual perſon, but that the whole human nature was conſidered in him. For it was not ſaid to our firſt parents only,

* Vid. Lipſii manuductionem ad Stoicam philoſophiam, l. ii. diſſert. 12.

† Deut. xxix. 14, 15.

Increaſe and multiply; by virtue of which word, the propagation of the human race is ſtill continued: nor is it true of Adam only, *It is not good that man ſhould be alone:* nor does that conjugal law concern him alone, *Therefore ſhall a man leave his father and his mother, and theſe two ſhall be one fleſh;* which Chriſt ſtill urges:* nor did the penalty, which God threatened to Adam in caſe of ſin, affect him alone. *Dying thou ſhalt die;* but *death paſſed upon all men*, as the apoſtle obſerves.† All which loudly proclaim, that Adam was here conſidered as the *head* of mankind.

XV. To the ſame purpoſe is that beautiful oppoſition of *the firſt and ſecond Adam*, which Paul purſues at large, Rom. v. 15. & ſeq. For as the ſecond Adam does in the covenant of grace ſuſtain the perſon of all the elect, ſo far as they are accounted to have themſelves done and ſuffered, what he did and ſuffered in their name and ſtead; ſo likewiſe the firſt Adam ſuſtained the perſon of all that were to ſpring from his ſtock.

XVI. That God was righteous in this conſtitution, is not to be diſputed. For it does not become us to queſtion the right of God, or to inquire too curiouſly into it, much leſs to meaſure it by the ſtandard of any right eſtabliſhed amongſt us deſpicable mortals, when the fact is evident. We are previouſly to judge of God, *Thou art righteous in what thou ſpeakeſt, and pure in thy judgment.*‡ Truly he is unacquainted with the majeſty of the Supreme Being, and with his unſpotted holineſs, which in every thing is moſt conſiſtent with itſelf, who preſumes to ſcan his actions, and call his equity to account. A freedom which no earthly father would bear in a ſon, no king in a ſubject, nor maſter in a ſervant. And do we, mean worms of the earth, take upon us to uſe ſuch freedom

* Matth. xix. 5. † Rom. v. 12. ‡ Pſal. li. 6.

with the Judge of the whole univerſe! As often as our murmuring fleſh dares to bawl out, *The ways of the Lord are not equal;* ſo often let us oppoſe to it, *Are not thy ways unequal?**

XVII. Nevertheleſs it is uſual with us, that we more calmly acquieſce in the determinations of God, when we underſtand the reaſons of them. Let us therefore ſee, whether here alſo we cannot demonſtrate the equity of the divine right. What if we ſhould conſider the matter thus? If Adam had, in his own and our name, ſtood to the conditions of the covenant; if, having finiſhed the courſe of his probation, he had been confirmed in happineſs, and we his poſterity in him; if, fully ſatisfied with the delights of animal life, we had, together with him, been tranſlated to the joys of heaven; no body would have complained, that he was included in the head of mankind: every one would have commended both the wiſdom and goodneſs of God: not the leaſt ſuſpicion of injuſtice would have ariſen in any one, on account of God's putting the firſt man into a ſtate of probation in the room of all, and not every individual for himſelf. How ſhall that which in this event would have been deemed juſt, be unjuſt on a contrary event? For the juſtice or injuſtice of actions is not to be judged of by the event.

XVIII. Beſides, who is there of mankind that can bring himſelf to believe, that he, placed in the ſame circumſtances with Adam, would have better conſulted his own intereſt? Adam was not without wiſdom, holineſs, a deſire after true happineſs, an averſion to the miſeries denounced by God againſt the tranſgreſſor, nor, in fine, without any of thoſe things, by which one might confidently expect to be on his guard againſt ſin; and yet he

* Ezek. xviii. 25.

ſuffered himſelf to be inveigled in the ſnare by the craft of a flattering ſeducer. And doſt thou, moſt iniquitous cenſurer of the ways of the Lord, boaſt thou wouldſt have better uſed thy free-will? Nay, on the contrary, all thy actions cry aloud, that thou approveſt, that thou art highly pleaſed with, and always takeſt example from that deed of thy firſt parent, about which thou unjuſtly complaineſt. For when thou tranſgreſſeſt the commands of God, when thou ſetteſt leſs by the will of the Supreme Being than by thy luſts, when thou preferreſt earthly to heavenly things, preſent to future; when, by thine own choice, thou ſeekeſt after happineſs, but not that which is true; and, inſtead of taking the right way, goeſt into by-paths; is not that the very ſame, as if thou didſt ſo often eat of the forbidden fruit? Why then doſt thou blame God for taking a compendious way, including all in one; well knowing, that the caſe of each in particular, when put to the teſt, would have been the ſame?

CHAP. III.

Of the Law, or Condition of the Covenant of Works.

HITHERTO we have treated of *the contracting parties.* Let us now take a view of the *condition* preſcribed in the covenant. Where, firſt, we are to conſider *the law of the covenant*, then the *obſervance* of that law. The law of the covenant is twofold. 1. *The law of nature*, implanted in Adam at his creation. 2. *The ſymbolical law*, concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

II. *The law of nature*, is *the rule of good and evil, inſcribed by God on man's conſcience, even at his creation, and therefore binding upon him by divine authority.* That

there was such a law connate with, and as it were implanted in man, appears from the relics, which, like the ruins of some noble building, still remain in all men; namely, from those common notions, by which the Heathens themselves distinguish right from wrong, and by which *they are a law to themselves, which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness.** From which we gather, that all these things were complete in man, when newly formed after the image of God.

III. Whatever the conscience of man dictates to be virtuous or otherwise, it does so in the name of God, whose vicegerent it is in man, and the depositary of his commands. This, if I mistake not, is David's meaning,† *To thee*, that is, for thee, in thy stead, *my heart says*, or my conscience. This conscience therefore was called a *God* by the Heathens: as in this Iambic. BROTOIS HAPASIN HE SUNEIDESIS THEOS. *In all men conscience is a God.* Plato, in Philebus, calls *reason a God dwelling in us.* And hence it is, that we are not to think that the supreme rule in the law of nature is its agreement or disagreement with the rational nature; but that it is the divine wisdom manifested to, or the notion of good and evil engraved by God on the conscience. The Author of the book *de mundo*‡ finely says, "God is to us a law, tending on all sides to a just equilibrium, admitting no correction, nor any variation." With this Cicero agrees,§ "The true and leading law, which is proper both to command and to forbid, is the right reason of the Supreme Being."

IV. That author does not express himself very accurately, who said, "We here call the law the knowledge

* Rom. ii. 14, 15. † Psal. xxvii. 8. ‡ Cap. xi. § De legibus, l. ii.

of right and wrong, binding to do what is right, and to avoid what is wrong." For the law is not properly knowledge, but the object of knowledge. We say this law was naturally known to man; but it would be absurd to say, that knowledge is naturally known. Knowledge is our act, and is indeed to be squared by the rule of the law. The law is a rule prescribed by God, the director of all our actions.

V. Another is farther from accuracy, who thus determines: "Before the fall there was properly no law. For then the love of God prevailed, which requires no law. There" (as the same author elsewhere explains himself) "was a state of friendship and love, such as is the natural state of a son with respect to a parent, which nature loves. But when that love is violated, then a precept is superadded; and that love, which before was voluntary (which best agrees with its nature, for that can scarce be called love, unless voluntary) falls under a precept, and passes into a law, to be enforced then with commination and coercion; which rigour of coercion properly constitutes a law."

VI. But this way of reasoning does not seem to be the effect of thought and attention. For, 1. it is not the rigour of coercion that properly constitutes a law, but the obligatory virtue of what is enjoined, proceeding both from the power of the lawgiver, and from the equity of the thing commanded; which is here founded on the holiness of the divine nature, so far as imitable by man. The apostle James* commends *the perfect law of liberty*. 2. Nor is it absurd to say, that the natural state of a son with respect to a parent is regulated by laws. Surely Plato† says, that "the first mortals followed the customs and laws of their fathers," quoting

* Chap. i. 25. † De legibus, l. iii.

with praise that sentence of Homer, THEMISTEUEI DE HEKASTOS PAIDON, *Every one makes laws for his children.* 3. Nor is it repugnant to do a thing by nature, and at the same time *by a law.* Philo the Jew,* explaining that hackneyed saying of the philosophers, says, that "to live agreeably to nature," is done, "when the mind follows God, remembering his precepts." Chrysippus in like manner, commended by Laertius,† says, "That person lives agreeably to nature, who does nothing prohibited by the common law, which is right reason." In a sublimer style almost than one could well expect from a Heathen, is what Hierocles‡ says, "To obey right reason and God, is the same thing. For the rational nature being illuminated, readily embraces what the divine law prescribes. A soul which is conformed to God, never dissents from the will of God; but being attentive to the divinity and brightness, with which it is enlightened, does what it does." 4. Nor can it be affirmed, that after the breach of love, or, which is the same thing, after the entrance of sin, the law was then superadded; seeing sin itself is ANOMIA, the transgression of the law. 5. Nor is love rendered less voluntary by the precept. For the law enjoins love every way perfect, and therefore as voluntary as possible, not extorted by the servile fear of the threatening.§ Nor does he salve the matter, when he says, that what is called love *scarce* deserves that name, unless it be voluntary: he ought to say, it is *by no means* charity, unless voluntary. For love is the most delightful union of our will with the thing beloved; which cannot be so much as conceived, without the plainest contradiction, to be any other than voluntary. If therefore, by the superadded law, love is rendered involuntary and forced, the whole

* De migrat. † Lib. vii. in Zenone. ‡ Ad aurea carmina Pythagoræ. § 1 John iv. 18.

nature of love is made void, and a divine law ſet up, which deſtroys love. 6. In fine, the law of nature itſelf was not without a threatening, and that of eternal death. I ſhall conclude this ſubject in the moſt accurate words of Chryſoſtom.* "When God formed man at firſt, he gave him a natural law. And what then is this natural law? He rectified our conſcience, and made us have the knowledge of good and evil, without any other teaching than our own."

VII. We muſt, moreover, obſerve, that this natural law is the ſame in ſubſtance with that expreſſed in the decalogue, being, what the apoſtle calls, *the commandment which is unto life*;† that is, that law, by the performance of which, life could formerly be obtained. And ſurely the decalogue contains ſuch precepts, *which if a man do, he ſhall live in them.*‡ But thoſe precepts are undoubtedly the law propoſed to Adam, upon which the covenant of works was built. Add to this, what the apoſtle ſays, that that law, which ſtill continues to be the rule of our actions, and whoſe *righteouſneſs* ought to be fulfilled in us, was made *weak through the fleſh*, that is, through ſin, and that it was become impoſſible for it to bring us to life.§ The ſame law therefore was in force before the entrance of ſin, and, if duly obſerved, had the power of giving life. Beſides, God, in the ſecond creation, inſcribes the ſame law on the heart, which in the firſt creation he had engraved on the mind. For what is regeneration, but the reſtitution of the ſame image of God, after which man was at firſt formed? In ſhort, the law of nature could be nothing but a precept of conformity to God, and of perfect love; which is the ſame in the decalogue.

* Ex homilia xii. † Rom. vii. 10. ‡ Lev. xviii. 5. § Rom. viii. 3, 4.

VIII. This law is deduced by infallible conſequence from the very *nature of God and man*: which I thus explain and prove. I preſuppoſe, as a ſelf-evident truth, and clear from the very meaning of the words, that the great God has a ſovereign and uncontroulable power and dominion over all his creatures. This authority is founded primarily and radically, not on creation, nor on any contract entered into with the creature, nor on the ſin of the creature, as ſome leſs ſolidly maintain; but on the majeſty, ſupremacy, ſovereignty, and eminence of God, which are his eſſential attributes, and would have been in God, though no creatures had actually exiſted, though they are now conceived by us with a certain reſpect to creatures, at leaſt poſſible. From this majeſty of the divine nature, the prophet Jeremiah infers the duty of the creature. *For as much as there is none like unto thee, O Lord, thou art great, and thy name is great in might. Who would not fear thee, O King of nations? for to thee doth it appertain.** For if God is *the firſt*, *the ſupreme*, *the ſupereminent*, it neceſſarily follows, that all creatures do in every reſpect depend on that *firſt*, *ſupreme*, and *ſupereminent* God, for *exiſtence*, *power*, and *operation*. This is of the eſſence of creatures, which, if not entirely dependent, can by no means be conceived without the moſt evident contradiction. But the more degrees of being there are in any creature, the more degrees of dependence on the ſupreme Being are to be aſſigned to it. In the rational creature, beſides a *metaphyſical* and *phyſical* entity, which it has in common with all the other creatures; there is a certain more perfect degree of entity, namely, *rationality*. As, therefore, in quality of *a being*, it depends on God, *as the Supreme Being*; ſo alſo, as *rational*, it depends on God as the *ſupreme reaſon*,

* Jer. x. 6, 7.

which it is bound to expreſs, and be conformable to. And as God, as long as he wills any creature to exiſt, neceſſarily wills it to be dependent on his *real providence;* (otherwiſe he would renounce his own ſupremacy, by transferring it to the creature;) ſo likewiſe, if he wills any rational creature to exiſt, he neceſſarily wills it to be dependent on his *moral providence;* otherwiſe he would deny himſelf to be the ſupreme reaſon, to whoſe pattern and idea every dependent reaſon ought to conform. And thus a rational creature would be to itſelf, the prime reaſon, that is, really God; which is an evident contradiction.

IX. In vain therefore do frantic enthuſiaſts inſiſt, that the utmoſt pitch of holineſs conſiſts in being without law; thereby wreſting the ſaying of the apoſtle, *that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawleſs and diſobedient.** For certainly that paſſage does not deſtroy our aſſertion, by which we have evinced, that the human nature cannot be without the divine law; but highly confirms it. For ſince the ungodly are here deſcribed as *lawleſs*, who would fain live as without law, and *diſobedient*, who will not be in ſubjection; it follows, that the acknowledging the divine law, and the ſubjection of the underſtanding and will to it, is the character of the righteous and godly. In the law of God, ſince the entrance of ſin, two things are to be conſidered. 1. The *rule* and direction to *obedience.* 2. *The power of bridling and reſtraining* by terror and fear; and laſtly, of *juſtly condemning.* When therefore the apoſtle teaches, that the law was not made for a righteous man, he does not underſtand it of the primary and principal work of the law, which is eſſential to it, but of that other accidental work, which was added to it on account of

* 1 Tim. i. 9.

and ſince the entrance of ſin, and from which the righteous are freed by Chriſt.

X. Nor does that follow only from the nature of God and man, that ſome law is to be preſcribed by God to man in common, but alſo ſuch a law as may be not only the rule and guide of human actions, but of human nature itſelf conſidered as rational. For ſince God himſelf is in his nature infinitely holy, and manifeſts this his holineſs in all his works, it hence follows, that to man, who ought to be conformed to the likeneſs of the divine holineſs, there ſhould be preſcribed a law, requiring not only the righteouſneſs of his *works*, but the holineſs of his nature itſelf; ſo that the righteouſneſs of his works is no other than the expreſſion of his inward righteouſneſs. Indeed the apoſtle calls that piety and holineſs, which he recommends, and which undoubtedly the law enjoins, *the image of God*.* Now, an image ſhould reſemble its original. Seeing therefore God is holy in his nature, on that very account it follows, that men ought to be ſo too.

XI. A certain author has therefore ſaid with more ſubtilty than truth, "That the law obliges the perſon only to active righteouſneſs, but not the nature itſelf to intrinſic rectitude:" and conſequently, "that original righteouſneſs is approved indeed, but not commanded by the law: and on the contrary alſo, that original unrighteouſneſs is condemned, but not forbidden by the law of nature." For the law approves nothing which it did not command; condemns nothing which it did not forbid. The law is TORAH the doctrine of right and wrong. What it teaches to be evil, that it forbids; what to be good, it commands. And therefore it is juſtly called *the law of nature*, not only becauſe it can be known by

* Eph. iv. 24. Col. iii. 10.

nature as a teacher, but alſo becauſe it is *the rule of nature itſelf.*

XII. In fine, we are to obſerve concerning this law of nature, that at leaſt its principal and moſt univerſal precepts are founded, not in the *mere arbitrary good-will and pleaſure of God*, but in his unſpotted divine *nature.* For if it is neceſſary, that God ſhould therefore preſcribe a law to man, becauſe he is the original holineſs; it is no leſs neceſſary, that he ſhould preſcribe a law, which ſhall be the copy of that original. So that the difference between good and evil, ought to be derived, not from any poſitive law, and arbitrary conſtitution of the divine will, but from the moſt holy nature of God itſelf. Which I thus prove.

XIII. Let us take the ſummary of *the firſt table: Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. Should this command be ſaid to be founded in the arbitrary good pleaſure of the divine will, and not in the very nature of God, it may with equal propriety be ſaid, that God might abſolve us from the neceſſity of loving himſelf. That this is a thing impoſſible, appears hence: It is natural to God to be the chief good. It is included in the idea of a God, that he is the very beſt. It is natural to the chief good, that he cannot without blame but love what is propoſed worthy of the higheſt love. Whoever, therefore, ſhall affirm, that the neceſſity of loving God flows not from the very nature of God, advances the following contradiction: God is in his nature the chief good, and yet in his nature is not ſupremely amiable. Or this other: God is worthy of the higheſt love; and yet it is poſſible, that he who does not love him, does nothing unworthy of God. Theſe things involve a moſt palpable contradiction.

XIV. But to proceed: If the command to love God is founded, not in his nature, but in his arbitrary good

pleasure, he might have enjoined the hatred of himself. For, in things in their own nature indifferent, he who has the right of commanding, has also that of forbidding, and of requiring the contrary. Now, this assertion, that God can command the hatred of himself, besides being horrible to the ear, labours under a manifest contradiction. Which will clearly appear to every body, from a proper explication of the terms. God the chief good, supremely amiable, are terms equivalent; at least, the last is an explication of the preceding. To hate any thing, is not to esteem it as the chief good, nay not so much as good, and therefore so far from loving it, to be averse from it. Would it not therefore be a manifest contradiction, to suppose the most excellent God thus speaking to his creature: I am really the chief good, but I would not have you esteem me good: I indeed am worthy of the highest love, but I would have you judge me worthy of your hatred? He that does not see a contradiction here, must be blind.

XV. Moreover, I would ask those, if there are any that are otherwise minded, whether it is not naturally good, even antecedently to any free determination of the divine will, to obey God, when he commands any thing. If they own this, we have gained our point. If not, I ask further, whence then the obligation to obey? They cannot answer, from the command. For the question is, What binds me to obey that command? Here we must necessarily come to that sovereign majesty and authority of God, to whom it is criminal in nature to refuse obedience. Again, if it is not naturally good to obey God, it follows, that God can command, that no body obey him. A proposition not only inconsiderate, but full of contradiction. For to command, is to bind one to obedience. To say, Obey not, is to

diſſolve the bond of obligation. Therefore theſe are plain contradictions, I command, and, Do not obey me.

XVI. What we have proved concerning *the love* of God, which is the ſummary of the *firſt table* of the law, namely, that it is naturally good, might be alſo proved from the ſummary of the *ſecond table*, i. e. the love of our neighbour. For he who loves God, cannot but love his image, in which he views characters of the Deity clearly expreſſed, and not a ſmall degree of the *brightneſs of his glory*. Again, whoever loves God, will, by virtue of that love, ſeriouſly wiſh, deſire, ſtudy, and, as much as in him lies, be careful, that his neighbour, as well as himſelf, be under God, in God, and for God, and that all he has be preſerved for his glory. Again, he who loves God, will make it his buſineſs, that God may appear every way admirable and glorious; and as he appears ſuch moſt eminently in the ſanctification and happineſs of men,* he will vigorouſly exert himſelf, that his neighbour may be advanced to holineſs and happineſs. Finally, he who ſincerely loves God, never thinks he loves and glorifies his God enough: he diſcovers ſo much excellency in him, he ſees his name ſo illuſtrious, and ſo exalted above all praiſe, that he earneſtly deſires to have all men, nay all creatures, join him in loving and celebrating the infinite perfections of God. Now, this is the moſt ſincere and pure love of our neighbour, to ſeek that God may be glorified in him, and he himſelf be for the glory of God. Hence it appears, that the love of our neighbour is inſeparably connected with the love of God. If therefore it flows from the nature of God, to enjoin us the love of himſelf, as we have juſt proved; it will likewiſe flow from the nature of God, to enjoin us the love of our neighbour.

* 2 Theſſ. i. 10.

XVII. To conclude, if we conceive all holineſs to be founded on the arbitrary will of God, this greateſt of all abſurdities will follow, that God our lawgiver can, by commanding the contrary, without any regeneration or renovation of the inward man, make of the wicked and diſobedient, for whom the law is made to condemnation, perſons holy and righteous! A ſhocking poſition.

XVIII. Seeing theſe things are ſo, it is aſtoniſhing, that a certain learned perſon ſhould approve of this aſſertion, namely, "On the will of God not only things themſelves depend, but alſo every mode of a thing, the truth, order, law, goodneſs; and no goodneſs of the object can move it, or put a ſtop to it." It is indeed certain, that no bounds or rules can be ſet to the will of God, by any thing out of God himſelf: for that is repugnant to his ſovereign pre-eminence. Yet ſomething may and ought to be conceived, flowing from God himſelf and his intrinſic perfections, which hinders the act of the divine will; and this is not therefore good, becauſe God wills it; but God wills it, becauſe it is good; for inſtance, the love of God as the chief good. And they conſider things awkwardly, who make the holineſs of God to conſiſt only in the exact conformity of his actions with his will. "Which will" (ſay they) "is the rule of all holineſs," and ſo of the divine. On the contrary, as the natural holineſs of God ought to be conceived as prior to his will, ſo it is rather the rule of the will, than to be regulated by it. For this holineſs of God is the moſt ſhining purity of the divine perfections, according to which, agreeably to the moſt perfect reaſon, he always wills and acts. By this opinion, which we are now confuting, every diſtinction between what are called moral and poſitive precepts is deſtroyed; and Archelaus's ancient paradox revived, namely, "The

distinction of good and evil is not from nature, but from the law;" which has been adopted by Aristippus, and Theodorus surnamed *the Atheist*. "Than which opinion," says Cocceius,* "none can be devised more pernicious, and none more effectual for undermining all religion, striking at the very root of the divine justice and the necessity of a Saviour, and cutting out the vitals of piety."

XIX. And thus we have proved these three things concerning the law of nature, on which the covenant of works is founded, namely: 1. That it flows from the nature of God and man, that he prescribe some law to man. 2. And such a law, as may be the rule and standard, not only of our actions, but also of our nature. 3. That the most universal precepts thereof are at least founded on the nature of God. Let us now consider the other, the *symbolical law*.

XX. This law is to be found in Gen. ii. 16, 17. *And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayst freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.* Concerning this tree, three things are chiefly to be taken notice of. 1. That it is not quite certain, whether it was a single tree; since a whole species of trees might be forbidden to man. We shall afterwards repeat this remark, when we treat of the tree of life. 2. There seems to be a twofold reason for this appellation. (1.) In respect of *God*, who, by that tree, would try and know, whether man would continue good, by persevering in obedience, or swerve to evil by disobedience. In which sense God is said to have tried Hezekiah, *that he might know all that was in his heart.*† (2.) In respect

* Summa. theol. cap. xxiv. § 6. † 2 Chron. xxxii. 31.

of *man*, becauſe, if from love to God he obeyed this law of probation, he was to attain to the fruition of that beatic good, which is never perfectly known, but by the enjoyment: on the contrary, if diſobedient, he was to know by ſad experience, into what an abyſs of evils he had plunged himſelf.

XXI. 3. We are to conſider the tendency of ſuch a divine precept. Man was thereby taught, (1.) That God is Lord of all things; and that it is unlawful for man even to deſire an apple but with his leave. In all things therefore, from the greateſt to the leaſt, the mouth of the Lord is to be conſulted, as to what he would or would not have done by us in relation to theſe things. (2.) That man's true happineſs is placed in God alone, and that nothing is to be deſired, but with ſubmiſſion to, and in order to uſe it for him. So that it is HE only, on whoſe account all other things appear good and deſirable to man. (3.) That man ſhould cheerfully be ſatisfied without even the moſt delightful and deſirable things, if God ſo command; and ſhould think, that there is much more good in obedience to the divine precept, than in the enjoyment of the moſt delightful thing in the world. (4.) That man was not yet arrived at the utmoſt pitch of happineſs, but was to expect a ſtill greater good, after his courſe of obedience was finiſhed. This was hinted by the prohibition of the moſt delightful tree, whoſe fruit was, if any other, greatly to be deſired; and this argued ſome degree of imperfection in that ſtate, in which man was forbid the eating and uſe of ſome good. Compare what is to be ſaid, chap. vi. § 19.

XXII. Thus far of *the laws of the covenant*, both that of nature, and of this ſymbolical and probatory one. It now follows, that, according to what we propoſed, 1. we treat of the *obſervation* of thoſe laws. Now, *a moſt perfect obedience* to all the commands of God is requi-

ed, according to that rule, *Which if a man do, he ſhall live in them.** And ſince life was likewiſe promiſed upon obedience to the ſymbolical law about the tree of knowledge, which doubtleſs was a poſitive inſtitution; ſo (to remark by the way) it appears, that, by this repreſentation, thoſe precepts which are called moral, cannot be ſo diſtinguiſhed from poſitive, as if to the former alone this elogium were competent *Which if a man do, he ſhall live in them*, and not to the latter.

XXIII. This obedience does, in the firſt place, ſuppoſe the moſt exact preſervation of that *original* and primitive *holineſs* in which man was created. For, as we have already ſaid, God, by his law, does above all things require the integrity and rectitude of nature to be cheriſhed and preſerved, as man's principal duty, flowing from the benefit he has received. Secondly, From that *good principle*, *good actions* and *works* ought to be produced: *Charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conſcience.*† Thirdly, There ought to be a certain ready alacrity to perform all that God ſhall be pleaſed to reveal to man, as the *good pleaſure* and *appointment* of his will; ſo as to all he may ſay, *Speak, Lord, thy ſervant heareth.*

XXIV. A threefold *perfection* is required. 1. Of *parts*, as well in reſpect of the *ſubject*, ſo as the whole man, in ſoul and body, and all the faculties of both, employ himſelf in the ſervice of God‡ (for man is then TAM, *perfect*, when the outward man correſponds with the inward; the actions with the thoughts, the tongue and hands with the heart§;) as with reſpect to the *object*, ſo that all and each of the precepts be obſerved, without any ſin of commiſſion or omiſſion.‖ 2. Of *degrees*, which in the value of obedience excludes all EPIEIKEIAN, pardon and connivance, but ſtrictly urges obedience

* Lev. xviii. 5. † 1 Tim. i. 5. ‡ 1 Theſſ. v. 23. § Pſal. xvii. 3, 4. & xxxvii. 30, 31. ‖ Gal. iii. 10. Jam. ii. 10.

*with all the heart, with all the soul, and with all the mind ;** *with all our might.*† *Thou hast commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently.*‡ 3. Of *perseverance*, without cutting or carving upon that obedience which God rigorously requires ;§ pronouncing, that *all his righteousness that he hath done shall not be remembered, when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness*, which was fulfilled in Adam ; emphatical is that expression, *Cursed is he that confirmeth not* [does not stand to, does not constantly observe] *all the words of this law to do them.*‖

XXV. Such a perfect observance of the laws of the covenant, quite to the period which God had fixed for probation, would have given man a right to the reward. Not from any intrinsic proportion of the work to the reward, as the grosser Papists proudly boast ; but from God's engagement and acceptance, which was nowise unbecoming him to enter into. Nor had man, before the consummating of that obedience, even in the state of innocence, a right to life. He was only in the state of acquiring a right ; which would at length be actually acquired, when he could say, I have stood to the conditions of the covenant, I have perfectly and constantly done what was commanded, now I claim and expect, that thou my God wilt crown me with the promised happiness.

XXVI. How absurdly again do the Papists assert, that Adam, as he came from the hands of his Creator, as the adopted son of God, had a right to supernatural happiness, as to his paternal inheritance, "which," according to Bellarmine,¶ "is due to the adopted son of God, in right of adoption, previous to all good works." But this is truly a preposterous way of reasoning. For

* Matth. xxii. 37. † Deut. vi. 5. ‡ Psal. cxix. 4. § Ezek. xviii. 24. ‖ Deut. xxvii. 26. ¶ De Justificat. l. v. c. 27.

the right of adoption belongs to the covenant of grace in Chriſt Jeſus: *The adoption of children is by Jeſus Chriſt.** Beſides, if this opinion were valid, good works could not be required as a condition for acquiring a right to eternal life; but only ſerve to prevent the forfeiture of the right of a ſon: by which means the whole deſign of the covenant of works, and all the righteouſneſs which is by the law, are deſtroyed. In fine, what is more abſurd, than the trifling manner in which theſe ſophiſters talk of the grace of adoption, as giving Adam a right to enter upon an heavenly inheritance, in a legal covenant; when, on the other hand, they wickedly contend for the merit of works, under a covenant of grace? Where only that aſſertion is to be affirmed and applied, The inheritance is due to an adopted ſon of God, in right of adoption, previous to all good works.

* Eph. i. 5.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Promiſes of the Covenant of Works.

LET what has been ſaid ſuffice as to the *condition* of this covenant. We may now inquire into the PROMISES of it. Here, firſt, the Socinians come under our notice, who obſtinately deny all promiſes. For thus Volkelius* ſays, "Scarce, if at all, was any general promiſe made to the men of that age; but rather threatenings and terrors were then ſet before them. For we do not ſee God promiſing to Adam, upon his abſtaining from the fruit of that tree, any reward of obedience;

* De vera religione, l. ii. c. 8.

but threatening deſtruction, if he did not obey."* Of this aſſertion he aſſigns the following reaſon. "Moreover, the reaſon why God at that time would be obeyed, without almoſt propoſing any general reward, ſeems to be this; becauſe, at the very beginning of the world, he would ſhew to all, that he owed nothing to any, but was himſelf the moſt abſolute Lord of all."

II. To this I oppoſe the following things. 1. Man's natural conſcience itſelf teaches him, that God deſires not to be worſhipped in vain, nor that obedience to his commands will go unrewarded and for nought. The Heathens were alſo apprized of this. Let us hear Epictetus. He, in Arrian,† ſpeaks thus "If there are no gods, how is it the end of man to obey the gods? But if there are, and they be yet regardleſs of every thing, how will the matter be mended? But if they both are, and take care of human affairs, but men have no recompenſe to expect from them, nor I neither, will not the matter be ſtill worſe?" Let us add Seneca.‡ "God does not want ſervants. Why ſo? He miniſters himſelf to mankind; being every where preſent and at hand. He will never make a right progreſs, who does not conceive of God as he ought; dealing all things, beſtowing his benefits freely. Why are the gods ſo beneficent? It is owing to their nature.—The firſt article of the worſhip of the gods is, to believe that they are; then to render them the honor of their majeſty, and of their goodneſs, without which there is no majeſty: to know, that they preſide over the world, govern all things by their power, take ſpecial care of mankind, without neglecting individuals." In like manner, among the articles of the Jewiſh faith, it is eſtabliſhed, as a thing naturally known,

* Gen. ii. 17. † Diſſert. l. i. c. 12. ‡ Epiſt. 95.

that there are "rewards as well as punishments with God;" according to that common saying, "God defrauds no creature of its reward." The worship of God presupposes the belief of this: *For he that cometh to God, must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.**

III. 2. Moreover, this faith is not merely a certain persuasion of the mind, arising from reasoning and the consideration of the goodness of God; but to render it a genuine faith, it must rest on the word and promise of God. *Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*† 3. This was the intent of the tree of life, which the Socinians themselves‡ allow to have been a "kind of symbol, though obscure, of eternal life." Now, that symbol proposed to Adam, would have been of no use, unless he had understood it, and considered it as a seal of the promise made by God. It would have been a mere farce, to have prohibited man from access to, and eating of this tree after the fall, unless thereby God had shewn him, that he had forfeited the thing promised, and consequently was become unworthy of the use of that symbol and sacrament. 4. If no promise was made, they lived without hope. For the hope which maketh not ashamed, is founded on the promises. Now, this is the character of the woful calamity of those who are *without God in the world*, that they *have no hope.*§ 5. God represents to Cain a thing known long before, even by nature, much more by paternal instruction: *If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted?*‖ But did this maxim begin to be true, and to be known after the fall? 6. The very threatening infers a promise. The language of which at least is, that he was to be deprived of that happiness, which otherwise he would have continued to

* Heb. xi. 6. † Rom. x. 17. ‡ In compend. Socinian. cap. ii. § 5. § Eph. ii. 15. ‖ Gen. iv. 7

enjoy. So that from thence we may moſt certainly conclude, that man had no reaſon to be afraid of loſing that happineſs, as long as he kept himſelf from ſin. 7. By this aſſertion of our adverſaries, according to their own hypotheſes, all the religion of the firſt man is deſtroyed. Seeing, as our author writes at the beginning of this chapter, "the promiſe of rewards propoſed to well-doing, is cloſely interwoven with religion." 8. The reaſon he aſſigns for this aſſertion, is fooliſh and to no purpoſe. For after ſo many and ſuch liberal promiſes of eternal life, which God hath given us in Chriſt, is it now leſs evident, that God is indebted to none, and that he is the moſt abſolute Lord of all things? Does the Supreme Being, by his gracious promiſes, derogate any thing from his moſt abſolute dominion? Ought it not to be known in every age, that God owes nothing to any? How comes it then, that God did not always forbear promiſing.

IV. Let this therefore be a ſettled point, that this covenant was not eſtabliſhed without promiſes. Let us now inquire *what ſort* of promiſes God made to Adam. We believe that God promiſed to Adam *eternal life*, that is, *the moſt perfect fruition of himſelf*, to endure for ever, after having run the courſe of his obedience. We are induced to this belief by theſe arguments.

V. 1. The apoſtle teaches, that God, by his Son ſent in the fleſh, did what the law could not do, *in that it was weak through the fleſh.** Now, it is certain, that Chriſt hath procured for his own people a right to eternal life, to be enjoyed in heaven in its due time. This the apoſtle declares the law cannot now do, not of itſelf, or becauſe it has no ſuch promiſes, but becauſe it is *weak through the fleſh*. If ſin therefore had not inter-

* Rom. viii. 3.

vened, the law would have brought men to that eternal life, which Chriſt promiſes and freely gives to his people. This appears to me a concluſive argument.

VI. 2. 'Tis beyond diſpute among all, that Paul, in his epiſtles to the Romans and Galatians, where he treats of juſtification, does, under that name, comprehend the adjudging to eternal life. He is every where proving, that a ſinner cannot be juſtified, that is, lay claim to eternal life, by the works of the law; but never by this argument, that the law had no promiſes of eternal life, but becauſe man is by the law brought to the acknowledgment of ſin, and the confeſſion of deſerved damnation.* On this point he inſiſts with great labour, though otherwiſe he might have very eaſily cut ſhort the whole diſpute; by ſaying, that a title to eternal life was to be ſought for by faith in Chriſt; that in vain ye reſt on any law, tho' ye keep it ever ſo perfectly, in regard it has no promiſes of eternal life annexed to it. On the contrary, the apoſtle teaches, that the *commandment*, conſidered in itſelf, *was ordained to life*;† that is, was ſuch, as, by the obſervance thereof, life might have once been obtained: which if the law could ſtill beſtow on the ſinner, *verily righteouſneſs ſhould be by the law*;‡ that is, the right to that ſame happineſs, which now comes from faith in Chriſt. For the diſpute was concerning KLERONOMIA, the inheritance of eternal life, which was to be entered upon; whether now by means of the law, or by the promiſe of the goſpel.§ And he owns, it would be by the means of the law, could the law ZOOPOIESAI, *make alive*. And this could be done by that law, *which was ordained to life*.‖ But when could it do ſo? In the ſtate of innocence, before it was *made weak by the fleſh*. If Adam therefore had perſevered in obedience,

* Rom. iii. 19, 20. † Rom. vii. 10. ‡ Gal. iii. 21. § Ver. 18.
‖ Rom. vii. 10.

the law would have brought him to that ſame inheritance, which now in Chriſt is allotted, not to him that worketh, but to him that believeth. And this argument, if I miſtake not, is plain to any intelligent and attentive perſon.

VII. 3. We are above all to obſerve, how the apoſtle diſtinguiſhes the righteouſneſs which is of the law, from the evangelical. Of the former he thus ſpeaks :* *Moſes deſcribeth the righteouſneſs which is of the law, That the man which doth thoſe things ſhall live by them.* Of the ſecond he writes after this manner :† *The juſt ſhall live by faith.* On both ſides, the promiſe of life is the ſame, and propoſed in the very ſame words. For the apoſtle does not by the leaſt expreſſion hint, that one kind of life is promiſed by the goſpel, another by the law. Which, if it were true, ſhould for once at leaſt have been hinted ; as the doing this would have ended the whole diſpute. For in vain would any ſeek for eternal life by the law, if never promiſed in it. But the apoſtle places the whole difference, not in the thing promiſed, but in the condition of obtaining the promiſe ; while he ſays,‡ *But that no man is juſtified by the law in the ſight of God, it is evident ; for, The juſt ſhall live by faith. And the law is not of faith : but, The man that doth them, ſhall live in them.* That very life therefore was promiſed by the law to the man that worketh, which he now receives by faith in Chriſt. But to what man thus working was it promiſed ? to the ſinner only ? Was it not to man in innocency ? Was it not then, when it might truly be ſaid, If you continue to do well, you ſhall be heir of that life upon that condition ? Which could be ſaid to none but to upright Adam. Was it not then, when the promiſe was actually made ? For af-

* Rom. x. 5. † Rom. i. 17. ‡ Gal. iii. 11, 12.

ter the entrance of ſin, there is not ſo much a promiſe, as a denunciation of wrath, and an intimation of a curſe, propoſing that as the condition of obtaining life, which is now abſolutely impoſſible. I therefore conclude, that to Adam, in the covenant of works, was promiſed the ſame eternal life, to be obtained by the righteouſneſs which is of the law, of which believers are made partakers through Chriſt. But let none object, that all theſe arguments are fetched, not from the hiſtory of man in innocence, but from Paul's reaſoning. For it is no matter whence arguments are taken, if they contain a demonſtration to the conſcience, which I think is here evident. Undoubtedly Adam knew many more things than are contained in that very ſhort account given of him by Moſes. Nor does it appear to be without a myſtery, that Moſes more ſparingly delivers moſt of the particulars of that covenant, and only ſprinkles with a little light the ſhadow as of a flying image, to denote that it was to vaniſh.

VIII. 4. I will add another argument. It was entirely agreeable, that by covenant God ſhould promiſe Adam ſomething greater and better, to be obtained after finiſhing his courſe of obedience, than what he was already poſſeſſed of. For what kind of covenant would it have been, to adjudge no reward to his obedience, and his carefully ſtanding to the conditions of the covenant, but a continuation of thoſe bleſſings which he actually enjoyed already, and which it was not becoming God to refuſe to man, whom he had created? Now, Adam enjoyed, in paradiſe, whatever could be deviſed for natural and animal happineſs, as they call it. A greater therefore, and a more exalted felicity awaited him; in the fruition of which he would moſt plainly ſee, that *in keeping the divine commands there is great reward.** Let

* Pſal. xix. 11.

none object here to me the angels, to whom, he may pretend, nothing was promised by God, but the continuance of that happy state in which they were created. We are here to keep to the apostle's advice, *not to intrude into those things we have not seen.** Who shall declare unto us those things which are not revealed concerning the angels? Nay, if we may form probable conjectures, it appears to me very likely, that some superior degree of happiness was conferred upon the angels, after they were truly confirmed, and something more excellent than that in which they were at first created: as the joy of the angels received a considerable addition, when they beheld the divine perfections shining forth in the illustrious work of redemption; and, at the consummation of all things, the happiness of all the elect, both angels and men, will be complete; when Christ's whole body shall appear glorious, and God be glorified and admired in all his saints.

IX. It still remains doubtful, whether the life promised to Adam upon his perseverance, was to be enjoyed in *paradise*, or in *heaven*. The latter of these appears the more probable. 1. Because paradise is in scripture represented as a type of heaven, and heaven itself is called paradise,† by that exchange of names, which is very common between a sacrament and the thing signified thereby. But by what probability shall it be thought, that the reason of a sacrament should be added to paradise, after man's ejectment from it? 2. It is fit, that man, when translated to the most consummate happiness, should reside there, where God does most brightly display the rays of his glorious majesty; which doubtless he does in heaven, where he has his throne.‡ 3. As the earthly paradise was furnished with all the delights

* Col. ii. 18. † Luke xxiii. 43. ‡ Is. lxvi. 1.

and pleaſures belonging to this animal life, for which there is no occaſion in that moſt perfect and immediate fruition of God, all that entertainment being utterly excluded thence; heaven ought to be deemed a much more ſuitable habitation for glorified man, than the earthly paradiſe. We would not, however, deny, that happineſs is not ſuſpended on place; and that there is ſcarce any thing to demonſtrate this to be found in the ſacred writings. Therefore we ought not to contend with great vehemency of ſpirit about this queſtion.

X. This point is therefore eſtabliſhed: God promiſed to Adam eternal life. Here it may and uſes to be aſked, whence this promiſe flows, whether from the mere good pleaſure of the divine will, ſo that God would have acted nowiſe unworthy of himſelf, had he made no ſuch promiſe to man; or whether God's making covenant with man in this manner, was from the divine nature, and from what was ſuitable to it? Here indeed I think modeſty is requiſite. I ſhall therefore propoſe what I imagine I know or may reaſonably think concerning my God, with fear and trembling. Grant me, O God, to ſpeak in a holy manner, and becoming thy majeſty.

XI. And firſt, I lay this down as an acknowledged truth, That God owes nothing to his creature. By no claim, by no law, is he bound to reward it. For all that the creature is, it owes it wholly to God; both becauſe he created it, and alſo becauſe he is fixed in the higheſt and infinite excellency. Now, where there is ſo great a diſparity, there is no common ſtandard of right, on account of which he who is ſuperior in dignity is liable to give a reward.*

XII. I approve, on this ſubject, of Durandus's reaſoning, which Bellarmine was not able to overturn.

* Rom. xi. 35, 36.

"What we are, and what we have, whether good acts, or good habits, or practices, are all from the divine bounty toward us, freely giving and preserving them. And because none, after having given freely, is obliged to give more, but rather the receiver is more obliged to the giver; therefore, from good habits, and good acts or practices, given us by God, he is not bound, by any act of justice, to give us any more, so as, if he should not give, to be unjust, but rather we are obliged to God."

XIII. Whatever then is promised to the creature by God, ought all to be ascribed to the boundless *goodness* of God. Excellently speaks Augustine.* "God became our debtor, not by receiving any thing, but by promising what he pleased. For of his own bounty he vouchsafed to make himself a debtor." Now, since this goodness is natural to God, no less than holiness and justice; and it is equally becoming God to act, agreeably to his holiness, with a holy and innocent creature, as agreeably to his justice, with a sinful creature; so, from this consideration of the divine goodness, I imagine the following things may be very plainly inferred.

XIV. 1. That it is unbecoming the *goodness*, nay I would almost dare to add, and the *justice* of God, *to adjudge an innocent creature to hell torments.* Which paradox, not only some of the schoolmen, but, I am sorry to say, a great divine of our own, with a few followers, scrupled not to maintain. Far be it from us to circumscribe by any limits the extensive power of God over his creatures, by the bounds of a right prescribed to man, or by the fallacious reasonings of our narrow understanding. But be it also far from us to ascribe

* Ser. 16.

any thing to him, which is unbecoming his immenſe goodneſs and untainted juſtice. Elihu with great propriety joined theſe together. *With God is terrible majeſty. Touching the Almighty, we cannot find him out: he is excellent in power, and in judgment, and in plenty of juſtice; he will not afflict.** Truly, if God could thus torment an innocent creature, he would ſhew he was not pleaſed with the holineſs of the creature; as whom he would not only debar from communion with himſelf, but alſo give up to be torn in pieces by his enemies. When he deſtroys the wicked, he makes it plainly appear, that he is not delighted with wickedneſs, nay, in ſcripture-phraſe *hates* it.† Should he therefore in the ſame manner torment the pious, he would teſtify by this, that he did not delight in piety, but rather hated it. Which none without blaſphemy can conceive of God. And what elſe, pray, are the infernal pains? Are they not a privation of divine love? a ſenſe of divine hatred? the worm of conſcience? deſpair of recovering God's favor? How is it poſſible, without a manifeſt contradiction, to conceive this ever to be the caſe of an innocent creature? I confeſs it ſtruck me with horror, when I obſerved the moſt ſubtil Twiſs, in order to defend this paradox, chuſe rather to maintain, it were better to be eternally miſerable, and endure the torments of hell, than not to exiſt at all; and when he objected to himſelf the authority of our Saviour, plainly affirming of Judas, *It had been good for that man, if he had not been born*,‡ that he did not bluſh to anſwer, that "many things are ſaid in ſcripture in a figurative and hyperbolical manner, nay a great many things accommodated to the ſenſe of the vulgar, and even to human judgment, though erroneous;" which he applies to this

* Job xxxvii. 22, 23. † Pſal. v. 5. ‡ Matth. xxvi. 24.

sentence of our Saviour.* To what length is not even the most prudent hurried, when he gives too much way to his own speculations? I think Sophocles formed a sounder judgment than the very acute Twiss, when he said, "Better not to be, than to live miserable." And Æschylus, in Ixion, "I think it had been better for that man who suffers intolerable pains never to have been born, than to have existed." Bernard speaks excellently to the same purpose.† "It is not to be doubted, but it will be much worse with those who will be in such a state [of misery] than with those who will have no existence." For, as he says,‡ "the soul placed in that state, loses its happiness, without losing its being: whereby it is always constrained to suffer death without dying, failure without failing, and an end without a period."

XV. 2. God also cannot, from this his goodness, refuse to communicate himself, and give the enjoyment of himself, to an innocent and holy creature, or to love and favor it in the most tender manner, while it has a being and is such according to its condition. For a holy creature is the image of God himself. Now, God loves himself in the most ardent manner, as being the chief good; which he would not be, if he did not love himself above all. The consequence therefore is, he must also love his own image, in which he has expressed to the life himself, and, what is most amiable in him, his own holiness. With what shew of decency could he command the other creatures to love such as are holy, if he himself did not judge them amiable? Or if he judged them so, how is it possible he should not love them himself?

XVI. Further, God does not love in vain. It is the character of a lover, to wish well to, and, where ability

* De elect. p. 2. l. 1. § 4. p. 178, 179. † Ad Eugen. de consider. l. 5. ‡ In Cant. ser. 35.

is not wanting to his will, to do good to the object of his love. Now, in the good-will of God consists both the soul's life and welfare. And as nothing can hinder his actually doing good to those to whom he wishes well; it follows, that a holy creature, which he necessarily loves from the goodness of his nature, must also enjoy the fruits of that divine love.

XVII. Besides, it is the nature of love, to seek union and communion with the person beloved. He does not love in reality, who desires not to communicate himself to the object of his affection. Now, every one communicates himself just as he is. God, therefore, being undoubtedly happy, makes the creature, which he loves, and honors with communion with himself, a partaker of his happiness. I say, he makes the creature happy, in proportion to the state in which he would have it to be. All these things follow from that love, which, we have shewn, God does, in consequence of his infinite goodness, necessarily bear to the creature which is innocent and holy.

XVIII. The same thing may be demonstrated in another manner, and, if I mistake not, incontestably, as follows: The sum of the divine commandments is this: Love me above all things: that is, esteem me as thy only chief good: hunger and thirst after me: in me alone place the whole of thy happiness: seek me above all things; and nothing besides me, but in so far as it has a relation to me. Now, how can it be conceived, that God should thus speak to the soul, and the soul should religiously attend to and diligently perform this, and yet never enjoy God? Is it becoming the most holy and thrice excellent God, to say to his holy creature (such as we now suppose it) Look upon me as thy chief good; but know, I neither am, nor ever shall be, such to thee. Long after me, but on condition, thou never

obtain thy desire. Hunger and thirst after me; but only to be for ever disappointed, and never satisfied. Seek me above all things; but seek me in vain, who am never to be found? He does not know God, who imagines, that such things are worthy of him.

XIX. Finally, if it cannot be inferred from the very nature of the divine goodness, that God should give himself to be enjoyed by a holy creature, in proportion to its state; it is possible, notwithstanding the goodness of God, that the more holy a creature is, the more miserable it may be. Which I prove thus: The more holy any one is, he loves God with the greater intenseness of all his powers. The more he loves, the more he longs, hungers, and thirsts after him. The more intense the hunger and thirst, the more intolerable the pain, unless he finds wherewith to be satisfied. If therefore this thirst be great to the highest degree, the want of what is so ardently desired, will cause an incredible pain. Whence is inferred, that God cannot, consistently with his goodness, refuse to grant to his holy creature the communion of himself. Unless we yield this, it will follow, that, notwithstanding the goodness of God, it is possible for the highest degree of holiness to become the highest pitch of misery to the creature.

XX. But let it be again inculcated here (of which we gave a hint in § 8.) that this communion of God, of which we are speaking, which the goodness of the Supreme Being requires to be bestowed on a holy creature, is not all the promise of the covenant; which is at length to be given upon fulfilling the condition. For that is not to be reckoned among the promises of the covenant, which God gives his creature now, before he has performed the conditions of the covenant. Another and a far greater thing he promises, after the constancy of his obedience is tried, to which the creature acquires some

right, not simply because it is holy (for such it came out of the hands of its Creator) but because it has now added constancy to holiness, being sufficiently tried to the satisfaction of its Lord. The promises therefore of the covenant contain greater things than this communion and fruition of God, of whatsoever kind it be, which Adam already enjoyed, while still in a state of trial. A farther degree of happiness, consisting in the full and immediate enjoyment of God, and in a merely spiritual state, to last for ever, was proposed to him, which the scripture usually sets forth under the title of eternal life.

XXI. And this is the proper question, Whether the promise of eternal life, to be entered upon by all after running the course of obedience, flows from the natural goodness of God, or whether it is of free and liberal good pleasure? In which question indeed I know not, whether it is not safest to stop, till, coming to see God face to face, we may attain a fuller knowledge of all his perfections, and more clearly discern what is worthy of them. For, on the one hand, it appears to me hard to affirm, and somewhat too bold, for any one obstinately to insist, that it would have been unbecoming God and his perfections, to covenant with man in this manner; namely, If thou keepest my commands, I will embrace thee with my favor and most endearing love; I will not only save thee from all trouble, but also bless thee with an accumulation of every benefit, and with the communion of myself; till, having honestly discharged thy part, and being enriched with an ample enough reward, I will at length say, Now return to that nothing out of which thou wast created; and my will is, that this my last command be no less cheerfully obeyed than the others, lest, by this last act of disobedience, thou shouldst forfeit all the praise of thy former obedience. Has the creature any cause to complain of such a stipulation? Nay, why

ſhould he not rejoice in it, ſince it is far better to have exiſted for ſome ages, and to have been holy and happy, than never to have exiſted at all ?

XXII. On the other hand, I can ſcarce ſatisfy myſelf in removing ſome difficulties. For ſince (as we before proved) God does, through his natural goodneſs, moſt ardently love a holy creature, as the lively image of himſelf, how can he prevail on this his goodneſs to deſtroy that image, and undo his own work ? *Is it good unto thee, that thou ſhouldſt deſpiſe the work of thine hands*, which deſerves no ſuch treatment ?* If it is good, and for the glory of God, to have made a creature to glorify himſelf; will it be good, and for the glory of God, to annihilate a creature that glorifies him ? and thus in fact to ſay, Thou ſhalt not any more glorify me for ever ? Beſides, as God himſelf has created the moſt intenſe deſire of eternity in the ſoul, and at the ſame time has commanded it to be carried out towards himſelf, as its eternal good ; is it becoming God to fruſtrate ſuch a deſire, commanded and excited by himſelf ? Moreover we have ſaid, that it is a contradiction, for any to ſuppoſe God addreſſing himſelf to a holy ſoul in the following words : Hunger after me, but on condition you do not enjoy me. Yet in the moment we conceive the holy creature juſt ſinking into annihilation, it would, in conſequence of that divine command, hunger and thirſt after God, without any hope of enjoying him again for ever. Unleſs one would chuſe to affirm, that God at length will ſay to that ſoul, Long not for me any more, but acquieſce in this demonſtration of my ſupreme dominion, by which I order thee to return to nothing. But I confeſs I cannot comprehend, how it is poſſible, that a holy creature is not bound to conſider God as its ſupreme good, and conſequently pant after the enjoyment of him.

* Job x. 3.

XXIII. O Lord JEHOVAH, how little is it that we poor mortals know of thy ſupreme Deity, and thy incomprehenſible perfections! How little do our thoughts of thee correſpond to the immenſity of thy eſſence, of thy perfections, and of thy ſovereignty over the creatures! What mortal can take upon him to circumſcribe within his own limits, where thou doſt not lead the way! This we know, Lord, that thou art indebted to none, and that there is none who can ſay to thee, What doſt thou, and why doſt thou ſo? that thou art alſo holy, and infinitely good, and therefore a lover and rewarder of holineſs. May the conſciouſneſs of our ignorance in other things kindle in our hearts an ineffable deſire of that beatific viſion, by which, knowing as we are known, we may, in the abyſs of thy infinity, behold thoſe things, which we cannot now reach by any thought.

CHAP. V.

Of the Penal Sanction of the Covenant of Works.

IT remains, that we conſider *the penal ſanction*, expreſſed by the Lord in theſe words: *For in the day that thou eateth thereof* (the tree of knowledge of good and evil) *thou ſhalt ſurely die.**

II. Several things are here to be diſtinctly noted. 1. That all that God here threatens, is the conſequence and puniſhment of ſin, to be inflicted on none but the rebellious and diſobedient: and therefore Socinus and his followers moſt abſurdly make the death mentioned in the threatening, a conſequence not ſo much of ſin, as

* Gen. ii. 17.

of nature. The words of God are plain to any man's conſcience, which derive death from the eating of the forbidden tree. 2. That the ſin here expreſſed, is a violation not of the natural, but of the ſymbolical law, given to man for the trial of his moſt perfect obedience. From whence nevertheleſs he could moſt eaſily gather, that if the tranſgreſſion of a precept, whoſe univerſal goodneſs depends only on the good pleaſure of God, was thus to be puniſhed, what puniſhment does not the tranſgreſſion of that law, which is a tranſcript of the moſt holy nature of God, deſerve? 3. That it is altogether agreeable to God's authority and moſt righteous will, that there be a certain connection between the ſin and the puniſhment, pointed out by theſe words. This alſo is indicated by the ingemination, *Dying thou ſhalt die;* that is, thou ſhalt verily, ſurely, moſt certainly die. So that it is not poſſible for the ſinner to eſcape death, unleſs perhaps a proper ſponſor (of which this is not the place) ſhould undergo it in his ſtead. 4. That the words of the threatening are general, and that therefore by the term *death* ought here to be underſtood, whatever the ſcripture any where ſignifies by that name. For who will dare take upon him to limit the extent of the divine threatening, by a certain prerogative of his own? Nay, the words are not only general, but ingeminated too, that we may well know they are to be taken in their full emphaſis or ſignification. 5. That they are ſpoken to Adam, in ſuch a manner as to be verified in his poſterity alſo: a certain evidence, that Adam ſuſtained the perſon of all his poſterity. 6. That on the very day the ſin ſhould be committed, this evil would befal man. Juſtice required this, and the event has verified it. For, in the very moment that man ſinned, he became *liable* to death, and immediately, after finiſhing his ſin, felt *the*

beginnings both of corporal and ſpiritual death. Theſe things are expreſſed with far greater ſimplicity than in the fictions of the Jewiſh doctors, according to the account of Ben Jacchi,* who ſpeaks thus: "A thouſand years are as one time, and one day, in the ſight of the holy and bleſſed God, as it is ſaid,† *For a thouſand years are in thy ſight but as yeſterday.* And our doctors of bleſſed memory have ſaid, that Gen. ii. 17. *For in the day that thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die*, is to be underſtood of the day of the holy and bleſſed; and that therefore the firſt man did not complete his day (did not arrive at his thouſandth year;) for that of that day he wanted ſeventy years." But this is far fetched, and ſavours of rabbinical ingenuity.

III. It will be far more uſeful, a little more accurately to examine, what is here meant by the word *death*. And firſt, it is moſt obvious, that by that term is denoted that corrupt diſpoſition of the body, by which the ſoul is conſtrained to a ſeparation from it, now unfit for its reſidence. By this ſeparation, the good things of the body, which are unhappily doted on, the fruits of ſin, and the ſinner's ill-grounded hope, are ſnatched away at once. God intimates this,‡ *Till thou return unto the ground; for out of it waſt thou taken: for duſt thou art, and unto duſt ſhalt thou return.* That is, thy body, which was formed out of the earth, ſhall return to its principles, and be reduced to earth again, into which, by its nature, it is reſolvable, as being taken out of the earth. And the reaſon why it is actually to be reſolved into earth, is, becauſe it really is what God ſaid, *Thou art duſt*, now corrupted with earthly deſires, a ſlave to a body prone to ſin, and taken from duſt. In this ſenſe Abraham confeſſes himſelf to be *duſt and aſhes*,§ that is

* I Dan. vii. 25. † Pſal. xc. 4. ‡ Gen. iii. 19. § Gen. xviii. 27.

a ſinner and a mortal. And David ſays,* *He knoweth* JITZRENU *our frame* (called, Gen. viii. 21. JÆTZÆR HARANG an evil frame, which paſſage Kimchi properly directs to be compared with this) *he remembereth that we are duſt*, that is, attached to the ground, and viciouſly addicted to the good things of the earth. From this conſideration the prophet amplifies the mercy of God, in exerciſing it towards ſinners, in whom he finds nothing to deſerve his love. And by *duſt* is clearly ſignified, the body of ſin, If. lxv. 25. where it is ſaid of the ſerpent, the devil, now overcome by the kingdom of the Meſſiah, *Duſt ſhall be his food*; he ſhall only have the pleaſure to deſtroy the body, and men of carnal diſpoſitions. When therefore God, after the entrance of ſin, and on account of ſin, condemned Adam to the death of the body, it is not to be doubted, but he alſo compriſed this death in the commination. Unleſs we would venture to affirm, that God has inflicted greater puniſhments on the ſinner, than he threatened before the commiſſion of ſin.

IV. There is nothing ſo ſurpriſing but what a luxuriant fancy can deviſe. There is a certain learned man, who, from the words of Moſes above explained, can extract an extraordinary promiſe, and even clearer, and more pregnant with conſolation, than the prophecy concerning the ſeed of the woman. He thinks here is pointed out the period and boundary of toils; that the meaning is, *till thou ſhalt return to this land*, to paradiſe, the ſtate of happy ſouls, from which LEKACHTA, *thou waſt carried captive*. For thus Solomon LEKUCHIM LEMUTH, *captivated to death*, and Jeremiah LAKECHU, *thy children carried into captivity*. And he thinks, that the opinion of the Jews concerning the ga-

* Pſal. ciii. 14.

thering the ſouls of the pious into paradiſe, has no other paſſage or foundation to ſupport it. But this is the ſhameful ſally of a wanton imagination. We take pleaſure in what is ſound and ſober, and yields ſatisfaction to the conſcience. But to return to our ſubject.

V. It is no wiſe ſtrange, that the Socinians, whoſe practice it is to wreſt the ſcriptures, ſhould contradict this truth, and deny the death of the body to be the puniſhment of ſin. Their other perverſe hypotheſes require this. For, by denying this, they imagine, they can more eaſily anſwer our arguments, for original ſin taken from the death of infants, and for the ſatisfaction of the Lord Chriſt from his own death. And as they impiouſly deny the true Godhead of Chriſt, they extol this as the moſt excellent ſign of his fictitious divinity, that he was the firſt preacher, author, and beſtower of immortality. Their blaſphemies have been largely and ſolidly refuted by others. But I am ſorry, that any learned perſon of our own ſhould deny, that by the death denounced, Gen. ii. 17, the death of the body ought to be underſtood; and who thinks he grants a great deal, when he thus writes: "From which paſſage, if any inſiſt they can prove a manifold kind of death, eternal, ſpiritual, and corporal, and other afflictions, I can eaſily ſuffer them to fight with their weapons againſt the enemies, provided they can extort from them what they want." Theſe are none of the beſt expreſſions. Why do we without neceſſity grant ſo much to our adverſaries? What praiſe is it for us, to weaken thoſe arguments which have been happily made uſe of in defence of the truth? This learned perſon owns, that death is the puniſhment of ſin, and that it may be evidently proved from the ſentence pronounced upon Adam, Gen. iii. 19. What reaſon is there then not to believe, that the ſame death was propoſed to man in the preceding threatening?

Are not the words general, and ingeminated on account of their emphasis? Is not the death of the body expressly set forth by the very same phrase, 1 Kings, ii. 37, where Solomon tells Shimei, MOTH HAMUTH, *Thou shalt die the death?* Is not the very sound of the words such, as a man cannot but have this death of the body come into his mind, unless, being entangled with prejudices, he should refuse to understand here by death, what every one else does, when death is spoke of? Is it not also highly becoming the divine goodness and justice, to inflict nothing by a condemnatory sentence on a sinner, which was not previously threatened against sin; lest haply man should plead in excuse, that he did not know that God would so highly resent, and so severely punish sin? And seeing this learned person would have eternal death here meant, does not that include the death of the body? Is the former ever inflicted on man, without the latter, by raising him from that death, that the whole man, soul and body, may be eternally miserable? Why are thus suspicions entertained; of which, O grief, we have but too many? I could wish we could all cautiously speak, *with fear and trembling!* The learned gentleman will not, it is hoped, take it amiss, if I here suggest to him the very prudent advice of the very learned Cocceius, which in a like case he inculcates, on Gen. iii. § 190. "Those of our party," says he "want we should employ stronger arguments against the Jews. And certainly that admonition is good; namely, when we have to do with infidels, we are to make use of cogent arguments, lest we become the derision of infidels, and confirm them in error. But as to the inculcating of that rule, it is neither safe nor prudent, easily and frequently to oppose it to the arguments of ecclesiastics. For if thereby we refute them, *N. B.* we then go over to the side of the adversaries, and we arm them, and teach them

to cavil. But if we do not refute them, but only inculcate that admonition, an injury is certainly done both to the disputant and the hearer, and we seem to alledge our own opinion as an argument. Let every one therefore argue with the utmost solidity: if any manifestly abuses scripture, let him be corrected in a brotherly manner, upon pointing out his fault: for the rest, let the arguments of believers be thoroughly tried, and not hissed off the stage."

VI. Secondly, by death is here understood, all that lasting and hard labour, that great sorrow, all the tedious miseries of this life, by which life ceases to be life, and which are the cruel harbingers of certain death. To these things man is condemned, Gen. iii. 16, 17, 18, 19. The whole of which sentence is founded on the antecedent threatening. Such miseries Pharaoh himself called by the name of *death*.* And David† calls his pain and anguish, CHÆBLE MAVETH, *the bands* (sorrows) *of death*; by which death comes to bind and fasten men, that he may thrust them into his dark dungeon. Thus also Paul, *In deaths often*;‡ *We are always delivered unto death*;§ *Death worketh in us*.‖ As life is not barely to live, but to be happy; so death is not to depart this life in a moment, but to languish in a long expectation, dread, and foresight of certain death, without knowing the period of life foreordained by God. Finely to this purpose says Picus Mirandula.¶ "For we begin, should you haply not know it, to die then, when we begin first to live; and death runs parallel with life: and we then first cease to die, when we are set free from this mortal body by the death of the flesh."

VII. Thirdly, death signifies *spiritual* death, or the separation of the soul from God. Elegantly has Isidorus

* Exod. x. 17. † Psal. cxvi. 3. ‡ 2 Cor xi. 23. § 2 Cor. iv. 11. ‖ 2 Cor. iv. 12. ¶ De ente et uno.

Peluſiota defined it: *The death of the immortal ſoul is the departure of the Holy Spirit from it.* This is what the Apoſtle calls, *being alienated from the life of God,** which illuminates, ſanctifies, and exhilarates the ſoul. For the life of the ſoul conſiſts in wiſdom, and in pure love, having the rejoicing of a good conſcience. The death of the ſoul conſiſts in folly, and through concupiſcence to depart from God, and to be tormented with the rackings of an evil conſcience. Hence the Apoſtle ſays, We are *dead in treſpaſſes and ſins.*†

VIII. I would incline to explain this death more fully; not indeed in my own words, but in thoſe of another, than which I deſpaired to find any more emphatical. There is motion in a living body; and there is alſo in a dead body. But a living body is moved by vegetation, while it is nouriſhed, has the uſe of its ſenſes, is delighted, and acts with pleaſure. Whereas a dead body is moved by putrefaction to a ſtate of diſſolution, and to the production of loathſome vermin. Thus in a ſoul ſpiritually alive there is motion, while it is maintained, fed, and pampered with divine delights, while it takes pleaſure in God and true wiſdom, while, by the ſtrength of its love, it is carried to, and fixed on that which can ſuſtain the ſoul, and give it repoſe. But a dead ſoul has no feeling; that is, does not underſtand truth, loves not righteouſneſs, wallows and is tired out in the ſink of concupiſcence, teems with the worms of impure and abominable thoughts, reaſonings, and affections. Men therefore alienated from that ſpiritual life, which conſiſts in the light of wiſdom, and the activity of love, which delights in its own happineſs, and that preſent, are no better than living carcaſes; *dead whilſt living:*‡ and hence, in ſcripture, are ſaid to be ſpiritually dead.

* Eph. iv. 18. † Eph. ii. 1. ‡ 1 Tim. v. 6.

IX. The word NABAL, in Greek, APHRON, which the ſcripture applies to ſuch, is both emphatical and of a very fertile ſignification. For it denotes, *a fool*, corrupted in ſoul and body, void of that ſpiritual wiſdom, the beginning of which is the fear of the Lord. *Nabal is his name, and folly is with him*, is Abigail's character of her huſband.* Thus NABAL is oppoſed to CHACAM, *wiſe, O fooliſh people and unwiſe.*† 2. It alſo denotes a *wicked perſon; The fooliſh people have blaſphemed thy name.*‡ 3. And laſtly, it ſignifies *one in a dead and withered ſtate;* the root NABEL denoting *to wither and die away.*§ *The flower fadeth.* NEBELAH, is *a dead body; Thy dead men ſhall live.*‖ All which conjointly denote a man devoid of the wiſdom of God, overwhelmed with ſin, and deſtitute of the life of God; in a word, faded and breeding worms, like a dead body. In all which things ſpiritual death conſiſts.

X. This *ſpiritual death* is ſo ſin, and the natural conſequence of the firſt ſin, that it is at the ſame time threatened as the puniſhment of ſin. For in ſo far as it renders a man vile, entirely unfit for thoſe works, which alone are worthy of him, like the brute creatures, nay like the devil himſelf, unlike God, *the only bleſſed*, and conſequently highly miſerable, it muſt be the higheſt puniſhment of ſin.

XI. Fourthly and laſtly, Eternal death is alſo here intended. The preludes of which, in this life, are the terrors and anguiſh of an evil conſcience, the abandoning of the ſoul, deprived of all divine conſolation, and the ſenſe of the divine wrath, under which it is miſerably preſſed down. There will enſue upon this the tranſlation of the ſoul to a place of torments;¶ where ſhall be the hiding of God's face, the want of his glorious pre-

* 1 Sam. xxv. 25. † Deut. xxxii. 6. ‡ Pſ. lxxiv. 18.
§ Iſ. xl. 7. ‖ Iſ. xxvi. 10. ¶ Luke xvi. 23—25.

ſence, and a moſt intenſe feeling of the wrath of God, to laſt for ever, together with horrible deſpair.* At laſt will ſucceed, after the end of the world, the reſurrection of the body to eternal puniſhment.†

XII. And here again, the divinity of the Socinians, whom the Remonſtrants rival, thwarts the truth; maintaining,‡ "that by theſe words, *Thou ſhalt ſurely die*, or by any others elſewhere, Adam was not threatened with eternal death, in the ſenſe of the Evangeliſts (or Proteſtants) ſo as to compriſe the eternal death of body and ſoul, together with the puniſhment of ſenſe; but directly corporal death only, or a ſeparation of ſoul and body; which all the evils diſpoſing to death do precede; and upon which, at length, the eternal puniſhment of loſs, that is, the privation of the viſion of God, or of grace and glory, will enſue." Another of that claſs, who examined in French the doctrine of Amyrald and Teſtard, violently contends, that in the law there is no mention of the ſenſe of infernal pains, but that it is peculiar to the goſpel, and threatened at laſt againſt the profane deſpiſers thereof.§ Though elſewhere he adds thoſe "who ſtifle the light of reaſon, or hold the truth in unrighteouſneſs, the more freely to fulfil the luſts of the fleſh." As to others, he thinks that a "middle ſtate is to be aſſigned them, into which they may be received, different from the kingdom of heaven, and the damnation of hell-fire: ſuch as, perhaps, that they are for ever to remain in the duſt, to which they are to be reduced, and from thence never to ariſe."‖

XIII. Theſe things are the rankeſt poiſon. For either they tend to this, that they would have the ſoul of a ſinner to be cut off, deſtroyed, and annihilated; like

* Rev. xiv. 11. † Acts xxiv. 15. ‡ Ap. p. 57. § P. 59 & 114. ‖ Curcellæus, diſſert. de neceſſ. cognit. Chriſtian. § 5.

ſome of the Jews, and Maimonides himſelf, as quoted by Abarbanel, who place eternal death in this, *that the ſoul ſhall be cut off, ſhall periſh, and not ſurvive;** from which leaven of the Epicureans and Sadducees the Socinians profeſs themſelves not averſe: or elſe they aſſert what is the moſt abſurd, repugnant, and tends to weaken the whole authority of the ſcripture. For it can by no means be conceived, that the ſoul of man ſhould continue in a ſtate of exiſtence, excluded from the beatific viſion of God, deprived of the ſenſe of his grace and glory, and not be moſt grievouſly tortured with the loſs of this chief good; and this the rather, when conſcience upbraids the ſoul, which, through its own folly, was the cauſe of all this miſery, and torments it with the moſt dire deſpair of ever obtaining any happineſs. And ſeeing God does not exclude man from the viſion of his face, where is fulneſs of joy, without the juſteſt diſpleaſure, a holy indignation, and an ardent zeal againſt ſin and the ſinner; the privation of this ſupreme happineſs, proceeding from the wrath of God, cannot but be joined with a ſenſe of the divine wrath and malediction. Theſe things follow from the very nature of the ſoul, and deſerve a fuller illuſtration.

XIV. The ſoul of man was formed for God, as the ſupreme truth, *truth itſelf*, to be contemplated in his mind, and to be ſought after with all his ſoul and affection, as the ſupreme good, *goodneſs itſelf;* and it then truly lives, when it delights in the contemplation of that truth, and in the fruition of that goodneſs. But when, by the juſt ſentence of a deſpiſed Deity, it is excluded from that moſt pleaſant contemplation of truth, and moſt delightful fruition of goodneſs, it muſt own itſelf to be dead. And as it is delightful to enjoy a good extreme-

* In Mal. iv.

ly desirable and desired, so it must be as afflicting and painful to be disappointed of it. But since the soul, which is a spiritual substance, endued with understanding and will, cannot be without the active exercise of these faculties, especially when let loose from the fetters of the body; it must necessarily feel itself miserable, by the privation of the chief good; and, being conscious of its misery, must most bitterly bewail the want of that good, which it was formed to long after. To suppose a soul having neither understanding nor will, is to suppose a soul not to be a soul: just as if one should suppose a body without quantity and extension. Again, to suppose a soul sensible of its misery, and not grieved because of it, is contrary to the nature both of the soul and of misery. It is then a fixed point, that the punishment of loss in a human soul without the punishment of sense, is a senseless and self-destroying fiction.

XV. Further, as the soul cannot be ignorant that God is infinitely good, and that it is the nature of goodness to be communicative; it thence certainly gathers, that something exceedingly contrary to God must be found in itself, which he has the most dreadful detestation of, and on account of which that infinitely-good One can have no communion with his creature: and consequently that that non-communion is a most evident sign and sad effect of the divine displeasure, depriving man of the fruition of that good, by which alone he could be rendered happy. And thus in this punishment of loss there is an exquisite sense of the wrath of God: with which no torments of the body by material fire can be compared.

XVI. Besides, seeing the soul is conscious to itself, that by its sins it is the cause of this misery, it becomes enraged against itself, accuses, abhors, tears itself, acts the part of a tormentor against itself, and under this lash-

more severely smarts, than any criminal under the hands of the most unrelenting executioner. Add to this, that all hope of a happy restitution being cut off, and being racked with horrid despair, it is condemned to be eternally miserable. All these things are so closely connected, as to make themselves manifest to every conscience, upon a diligent attention.

XVII. The same things the scripture expressly teaches, when it speaks of *eternal punishment*,* and *torments*,† of *the worm that dieth not*, and *the fire that is not quenched*,‡ and the like; which expressions are too strong, to be understood of the punishment of loss only, without that of sense.

XVIII. And it is absurd to say, that this punishment is threatened only against the despisers of the gospel, seeing Paul testifies, that Christ will come, *in flaming fire, taking vengeance*, not only *on them that obey not the gospel*, but *on them that know not God*.§ Compare 1 Thess. iv. 5. *The Gentiles which know not God*. Such, namely, who would not know God even from the works of creation, and *did not like to retain God in their knowledge*.‖ Such as whom the very power of truth obliged Curcellæus to say,¶ *These are altogether inexcusable before God; and it therefore does not appear wonderful, if hereafter he should consign them to the punishment of eternal fire*. And surely our adversaries will not say, that the gospel was preached to those of Sodom and Gomorrah, and to the neighbouring cities. Of them however Jude writes,** that *they are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire*. Which words are not to be so interpreted, as to be restricted to that fire, wherewith those cities were burnt, but to be extended to the flames of hell, with which the lewd inha-

* Matth. xxv. 46. † Luke xvi. 23, 28. ‡ Mark ix. 44. § 2 Thess. i. 8. ‖ Rom. i. 28. ¶ Loco citato. ** Ver. 7.

bitants of thoſe cities are at this very day tormented. Thoſe things are to be diſtinguiſhed, which the very nature of the thing teaches to be diſtinct. We are to underſtand, their *giving themſelves over to fornication, and going after ſtrange fleſh*, of the inhabitants, and not of the towns. It is true of both, that they were burnt with fire: which, with reſpect to *the towns*, may *in ſome meaſure* be ſaid to be *eternal*, they being ſo conſumed, as that they never ſhall or can be reſtored. But it is *truly eternal*, with reſpect to the inhabitants, who, by that vengeance of God, were not annihilated; but at the time when the apoſtle wrote, having been caſt headlong into everlaſting pain and torment, ſuffered the puniſhment of that fire. For the portion of *whoremongers is in the lake which burneth with fire and brimſtone.** So theſe cities are an emblem or type of eternal fire; but their wicked inhabitants *ſuffer the vengeance of eternal fire*, and ſo both are for DEIGMA, an *example* (Peter ſays, HUPODEIGMA, an *enſample*†) by which we are reminded, what whoremongers are to expect.

XIX. To this purpoſe alſo Chriſt expreſsly declares, that all thoſe who ſhall be placed on his left hand, and not declared heirs of eternal life, ſhall, by a righteous ſentence, be condemned to *everlaſting fire, which is prepared for the devil and his angels*;‡ which fire is explained to be KOLASIN AIONION, *everlaſting puniſhment*.§ We cannot approve what Curcellæus‖ has written; that in "Matthew is not deſcribed a judgment in every reſpect univerſal, of all who ever had exiſted, but only of thoſe who made a profeſſion of the Chriſtian religion; ſome of whom behaved becoming the goſpel, others not." Theſe are expreſſions not of the beſt ſtamp. For ſhall not that judgment be univerſal, which our

* Rev. xxi. 8. † 2 Pet. ii. 6. ‡ Matth. xxv. 41. § Ver. 46.
‖ In the ſaid diſſertation, § 6.

Lord extends to *all nations* ?* to *all the tribes of the earth* ?† in which *every eye shall see* Christ the Judge ?‡ in which, according to Paul,§ *he will judge the world* ? in which both *sea, and death, and hell will deliver up their dead* to be judged ?‖ in which shall be accomplished the prediction, which God solemnly confirmed by oath, saying, *Every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God* ?¶ in which even *the men of Nineveh and the queen of the South* shall rise to condemn the wicked Jews ?** and their portion of torment be assigned to those of Tyre, and Sidon, and Sodom ?†† in which shall be inflicted on that *servant, who knew not his master's will, and did commit things worthy of stripes*, his due measure of stripes ?‡‡ in which, in fine, *they who sinned without law, shall perish without law* ?§§ To restrict all these things to those to whom the gospel has been preached, is for a man to make sport with scripture. But God will not be sported with.

XX. If Curcellæus should perhaps reply, that he denies not an universal judgment to come, but that it is not described in Matth. xxv. nor in those passages, in which the men to be judged are divided into two classes, as John v. 28, 29. 2 Thess. i. 6, &c. I answer, 1. That the scripture makes no mention but of one judgment, to be held on the last day; nor are we any where taught, that a different tribunal is to be erected for those, to whom the gospel was not preached, and for those to whom it was. Paul preached of *the judgment to come*,‖‖ in the singular number; and in like manner, of *eternal judgment*.¶¶ 2. The passages alledged have the marks of universality affixed to them. For it is said, John v.

* Matth. xxv. 32. † Matth. xxiv. 30. ‡ Rev. i. 7. § Acts xvii. 31. ‖ Rev. xx. 13. ¶ Rom. xiv. 11. ** Matth. xii. 41, 42. †† Matth. xi. 22, 24. ‡‡ Luke xii. 48. §§ Rom. ii. 12. ‖‖ Acts xxiv. 25. ¶¶ Heb. vi. 2.

28. ALL *that are in the graves ſhall hear the voice of the Son of man;* and, ver. 29. this univerſality is not to be divided into thoſe, who either by faith received the goſpel preached to them, or perverſely rejected it; but into thoſe *who have done good or evil*, without mentioning the goſpel in the leaſt. And, 2 Theſſ. i. 6, &c. the puniſhment of eternal deſtruction will be inflicted, by the ſentence of the Judge, not only on thoſe *who were diſobedient to the goſpel*, but alſo on thoſe *who knew not God*, viz. "God the Creator, to the knowledge and worſhip of whom nature alone might have led men, unleſs they had extinguiſhed its light through their wickedneſs," as Curcellæus himſelf explains it. 3. Nor is it any thing ſingular to diſtribute the perſons to be judged into two claſſes, but common in every judgment concerning the whole human race: of which there are but two diſſimilar bodies, either of thoſe to be acquitted, or thoſe to be condemned. The ſcripture knows nothing of an intermediate ſtate.

XXI. The only thing ſpecious adduced by Curcellæus, is this, that Chriſt cannot upbraid thoſe who knew nothing of his will, thus, *I was an hungry*, &c. But we anſwer, 1. That what Chriſt here ſpeaks, does not comprize the whole proceſs of the judgment, but only mentions this by way of example. For who doubts, that more things are to be conſidered in this judgment, even with reſpect to thoſe to whom the goſpel was preached, than barely thoſe effects of charity towards the godly when in diſtreſs? 2. The ſcripture declares, that *all the actions* of all perſons ſhall be tried in this judgment;* even *words*,† both the *idle*‡ and *hard*;§ nay, even *the ſecrets of the heart*.‖ 3. It is not our bu-

* Eccl. xii. 14. 2 Cor. v. 10. Rom. ii. 5, 6, &c. † Matth. xii. 37. ‡ Ver. 36. § Jude. ver. 14, 15. ‖ Rom. ii. 15, 16. 1 Cor. iv. 5.

ſineſs to determine with what the Judge may juſtly upbraid the damned. It is plain, he will upbraid them with thoſe things at leaſt, which they ſhall hear with the moſt dreadful amazement. And ſeeing all thoſe to be damned have diſcovered many evidences of an unrelenting, unmerciful, and unbeneficent diſpoſition; who of us ſhall dare to forbid Chriſt to interpret this their conduct, as if they would have ſhewn himſelf no kind of compaſſion, had he come among them in perſon? 4. and laſtly, Granting that Chriſt may not upbraid all the wicked with this, yet it does not follow from thence, that they will not come into this judgment; becauſe there are many other things, on account of which they ſhall be condemned, which, the ſcripture elſewhere teaches, are to be tried in this judgment, though in this ſummary Chriſt makes no mention of them. There is nothing to oblige us to believe, that every thing relative to this judgment, is to be learned from this paſſage alone. Other teſtimonies of ſcripture are to be conſulted, which treat on the ſame ſubject.

XXII. It remains, that we inquire, whence this penal ſanction is to be derived; whether from the ſole and mere good pleaſure of the divine will, or from the natural and immutable juſtice of God, which it would have been unbecoming to have ordered otherwiſe. I will not now repeat what the antagoniſts of the Socinians have fully and happily illuſtrated concerning vindictive juſtice, as a property eſſential to God, and the neceſſity of its exerciſe in caſe of ſin. Firſt, I ſhall only propoſe ſome arguments, by which I think this general propoſition may be moſt evidently demonſtrated, that it has a foundation in God's very nature and immutable right, not to let ſin go unpuniſhed; and then more ſpecially inquire into the eternity of puniſhment.

XXIII. And first, Let us consider the infinite *majesty* of God, and his supreme *excellence* above all things; which is so illustrious, that it obliges rational creatures, capable of knowing it, to obey and serve him, as we proved, chap. ii. § 8. So that as often as they act contrary in the least to this obedience, they directly make themselves guilty of high treason against the divine majesty, and consequently, for neglect of obedience, are bound over to a vicarious punishment. For "the sinner," as Thomas [Aquinas] justly said, "as much as in him lies, destroys God and his attributes," slighting that majesty of God, to which it is necessary that all things be subject, from the consideration both of God and the creatures. Now, it is altogether impossible, that God should not love, in the tenderest manner, himself, his majesty, and his glory. And he cannot but resent any injury done to what he thus loves. And therefore he calls himself, EL KANNA, *a jealous God*, and declares that this is his name.* But KINAH denotes *resentment for the dearest thing:* and hence *jealousy* and *great fury* are joined together.† But he is chiefly jealous for his *name*, that is, that he be made known to men as he is, *And will be jealous for my holy name.*‡ In which name even this is contained, *And will by no means clear the guilty.*§

XXIV. We may otherwise too argue from the majesty of God, and in this manner. It is altogether *impossible*, that God *should deny himself.*‖ That is, he cannot dissemble his own perfections, or do any thing to make him appear to be what he is not, or that he is not possessed of properties truly divine: and that because he is himself the archetype and exemplar of the intelli-

* Exod. xxxiv. 14. † Zech. viii. 2. ‡ Ezek. xxxix. 25.
§ Exod. xxxiv. 7. ‖ 2 Tim. ii. 13.

gent creature, whose province it is to shew to the creature, in his works, his nature, dignity, prerogative, and excellence. He would therefore deny himself if he should conceal his majesty, much more if he should suffer man to slight it, which is done by every sin. For the sinner behaves so in his presence, as if there were no God, to whom he owed obedience; nay, as if he himself was God, who could dispose of himself, his faculties, and other things in which he sins, at his own pleasure, and without any control, saying, *Who is Lord over me?** Which is truly to fly in the face of the majesty of the Supreme Being. But how can God suffer this to pass unpunished? Unless we can supppose he can bear one to be equal to himself, which would be an open denial of his supremacy, majesty, and excellency. But he then appears glorious to sinners, when he punishes the despisers of his Deity. Thus,† he swears, that *all the earth shall be filled with the glory of God;* namely, by destroying, in the wilderness, those who did not believe, after they had seen the glory of God and his signs. The *glory of God*, in this passage, signifies the manifestation of his jealousy against those who despised him, when he does not suffer himself *to be mocked.* Therefore, as he cannot but seek his own glory, so he cannot suffer him who profanes his majesty to go unpunished.

XXV. Secondly, This may be made no less evidently to appear from the *holiness* of God, and that in more ways than one.

XXVI. 1. God's holiness requires this, that he cannot admit a sinner to union and communion with himself, without satisfaction to his justice. For TIS METOCHE, *what fellowship* [participation] *hath righteousness with unrighteousness?*‡ He that touches what is un-

* Psal. xii. 5. † Numb. xiv. 20. ‡ 2 Cor. vi. 14.

clean, can have no communion with God.* Him whom God unites to himſelf, *he cauſeth to cleave to him as a girdle*, that he may be unto him *for a name, and for a praiſe, and for a glory.*† But if he ſhould thus as it were gird the ſinner to himſelf, without a previous ſatisfaction, by which the guilt of ſin is removed, holineſs itſelf would as it were be girded to, clothed and attended with ſin: which is a plain contradiction. It is true indeed, that God offered all theſe things to ſinful Iſrael; but that was done by virtue of the covenant of grace, which ſuppoſes a due ſatisfaction. Nor are we to imagine, that this union, which God deſcribes in ſuch magnificent language, was the lot of any others, in its full emphaſis and ſpiritual import, but of thoſe who were eternally in covenant. Compare Deut. xxvi. 19. If you object, that it is really unbecoming the holineſs of God, to favor the ſinner with a communion of friendſhip, while he continues ſuch; but that nothing hinders him, out of his goodneſs, to take away ſin, and in this manner to admit to his fellowſhip him who was before a ſinner: I anſwer, that, without a ſatisfaction, it is not conſiſtent with the holineſs of God, to prevent the ſinner with that greateſt effect of his love, by which he may be ſanctified. For if the beginning of ſuch a communion of God with the ſinner be not unbecoming his holineſs, why do all allow it as to the progreſs thereof? It is plain, it is not ſuitable to the holineſs of God to cultivate a friendſhip with the ſinner, ſo long as he continues ſuch. But before he be ſanctified, he is nothing but a ſinner, nay ſin itſelf. Nor can a greater inſtance of friendſhip be given to man, than that by which he is ſanctified. Therefore it is not conſiſtent with the holineſs of God, without any ſatisfaction, to prevent with ſo

* Ver. 17. † Jer. xiii. 11.

great a favor the sinner, who is most worthy of all his hatred. If you still insist, that it is inconsistent with the holiness of God to love the sinner with a love of complacency, without a satisfaction, but that nothing hinders him from loving him with a love of benevolence, which may transform him, as to render him a fit object of the love of complacency: I answer, that this is spoken at random: for those effects of the love of benevolence by which we are regenerated, are proposed to us in scripture, as consequences of the engagement and satisfaction of Christ, and of our reconciliation with God.* Faith, without which it is impossible to please God, is freely bestowed on the elect, *thro' the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*† Whatsoever way you interpret this, it appears at least, that the gift of faith is founded on Christ and his satisfaction. If therefore the satisfaction of Christ was previously requisite, to the sinner's being blessed with those effects of the love of benevolence; it is rashly asserted, that it was becoming the holiness of God to bestow them on the sinner without a satisfaction. Moreover, God cannot but punish those to whom he cannot grant union with himself; because the greatest punishment consists in the want of this union. This is that death, with which the law threatens the sinner, as we have already made appear.

XXVII. 2. The holiness of God is so unspotted, that *he cannot behold evil, and look on iniquity*,‡ that is, bear it in his sight. He cannot therefore *lift up the light of his countenance upon him*,§ in which the salvation of men consists. Now, the privation of salvation is the highest punishment. When David refused to admit his son Absalom to his sight, though almost reconciled to him, this appeared to Absalom more intolerable than

* Tit. iii. 4, 5. 1 Cor. vi. 11. 1 Pet. i. 3. † 2 Pet. i. 1.
‡ Hab. i. 14. § Psal. iv. 7.

any death.* So that in a nature ſenſible of its unhappineſs, a puniſhment of ſenſe cannot but accompany a puniſhment of loſs.

XXVIII. 3. From the holineſs of God flows a deadly hatred of ſin. It is as much the nature of holineſs to *hate iniquity*, as to *love righteouſneſs*.† Sin is *an abomination to his ſoul*,‡ that is, to his very eſſence, and eſſential holineſs; and not *ſin* only, but alſo the *ſinner*. *All that do ſuch things, and all that do unrighteouſly, are an abomination to the Lord thy God.*§ Him therefore whom he cannot bleſs with a participation of his favor, he ſeparates from himſelf, and from his choſen people, and inflicts upon him that puniſhment, which is the effect of his hatred. According to Solomon's reaſoning, *Every one that is proud in heart, is an abomination to the Lord.*‖ What then? *He ſhall not be eſteemed guiltleſs: he ſhall not be unpuniſhed.* David reaſons in the ſame manner, *Thou art not a God that haſt pleaſure in wickedneſs.*¶ Thou hateſt ſin, and the ſinner too, becauſe of it: *Thou hateſt all the workers of iniquity.* What is the fruit of this hatred? Exceeding bitter: *Thou ſhalt deſtroy them that ſpeak leaſing.* Thus from the holineſs of God ariſes a hatred of ſin and the ſinner; and from hatred, puniſhment.

XXIX. 4. Without doubt it is diametrically oppoſite to the holineſs of God, that he ſhould become like unto the ſinner. For ſince his image conſiſts in perfect holineſs, it is a contradiction, that his likeneſs ſhould conſiſt in ſin. But if God ſhould be unwilling to puniſh ſin, he would then become like unto the ſinner. This he himſelf teaches us:** when he would tell the ſinner, Thou thoughteſt that I would not puniſh thy ſin, he thus expreſſes it; *Thou thoughteſt that I was altogeth-*

* 2 Sam. xiv. 32. † Pſal. xlv. 8. ‡ Prov. vi. 16. § Deut. xxv. 16. ‖ Prov. xvi. 5. ¶ Pſal. v. 4, 5, 6. ** Pſal. l. 21.

er like thyſelf. But, ſays he, I will ſhew the contrary. And how? *I will reprove thee*, or puniſh thee. And ſo by that fact I will ſhew, that I am not like unto thee. Whence I conclude, that to be unwilling to puniſh ſin, is being very like the ſinner. On the contrary, to puniſh ſin, in its proper time, is to ſhew himſelf moſt unlike the ſinner. Therefore, unleſs God reproves the ſinner, he will be like to him, and deny himſelf. For, ſince God is a pattern to man, and man was made in order that God may be glorified in him; and all things which God hath made, have a tendency to this, that man may from them know what a God he is: if God ſhould by no method ſhew, that ſin deprives man of communion with God and of his kingdom; nay, ſhould he make the ſinner eternally happy, to be accounted unworthy of which is the greateſt puniſhment, God would certainly in that caſe teſtify, that he is not worthy to be loved, deſired, and glorified, and that ſin is not an object unworthy of man's delight. As far as it is impoſſible then, that God ſhould be altogether like the ſinner, ſo far it is impoſſible, that he ſhould let ſin go unpuniſhed.

XXX. 5. Hence it is that God ſays, he is ſanctified, when he requires puniſhment, Lev. x. 3. On which place, Crellius himſelf* makes this annotation: "Which ſome learned men explain," (and he himſelf agrees with them) "I ſhall appear holy," that is, "ſhall inflict puniſhment on them." The ſame thing he owns in the ſame chapter, "that neither the holineſs, nor the majeſty of God can in any reſpect bear to have his commands violated with impunity." Such is the power of truth, that it even breaks forth from the moſt refractory hearts. And the ſenſe of this word is very evident, Ezek.

* De vera relig. lib. i. c. 28.

xxxviii. 16. where the punishment of God is foretold in these words: *That the Heathen may know me, when I shall be sanctified in thee*, viz. by thy punishment, *before their eyes:* more clearly still, If. v. 16. *God that is holy, shall be sanctified in righteousness*, by inflicting on sinners the punishments threatened in the foregoing verses, and by not pardoning the elect, unless on account of the righteousness of Christ, in whose sufferings and death he displayed his most unspotted holiness, and his hatred of sin, before the whole world, nay, even before hell itself. It is therefore as necessary, that God should take punishment on sin, as that he should be holy, lest he should seem to give up with his holiness. I shall conclude in the words of Joshua,* *He is an holy God.* What then? *He is a jealous God.* And what does he infer thence? *He will not forgive your transgressions, nor your sins.* Thus from his holiness flows his jealousy; from his jealousy, his vengeance.

XXXI. Thirdly, This may also be inferred from that attribute of God, which is usually called *vindictive justice.* That it is the property of this to punish sin, the scripture tells us in a hundred places; and heretics impudently cavil, when they assert it to be the work, not so much of divine justice, as of wrath and passion. They unadvisedly disjoin what the apostle has conjoined, who speaks of *the day of wrath, and of the righteous judgment of God.*† And what is God's wrath other than that ready disposition of the divine mind to do that which his hatred of sin, justice toward the sinner, and his character as the supreme Judge, do require? I omit a thousand other considerations, which are every where obvious. I shall rather shew, where the hinge of the matter turns. 1. That this perfection is as natural to

* Chap. xxiv. 19. † Rom. ii. 5.

God, as infinity, holineſs, omnipotence. 2. That, in virtue of it, God cannot ſuffer ſin to go unpuniſhed.

XXXII. The former of theſe I thus prove. That this muſt be aſcribed, not to the indifferent will of God, but to the nature and eſſence of God, under the oppoſite of which it is a contradiction to conceive of him. But it is contradictory to conceive of God under the oppoſite of juſt, that is as unjuſt.* But it is not contradictory, if I conceive of God under the contraries of thoſe things, which depend on the mere good pleaſure of his will. For inſtance, it proceeded from the free will and pleaſure of God, that he formerly choſe Iſrael for his peculiar people. If therefore I conceive of God, as one who never was the God of Iſrael, I ſhall doubtleſs have formed a falſe conception, but nothing that, by an evident contradiction, deſtroys the nature of God. For he might have been God, and yet not the God of Iſrael; but, if he had ſo pleaſed, the God of the Egyptians or Chaldeans. But whoever ſays, that God is, and at the ſame time ſays that he is unjuſt, ſpeaks contradictory things. For the firſt conception of the Deity is, that he is perfectly and infinitely good. Juſtice belongs to this goodneſs, giving to every one his due, by a ſuitable compenſation, eſpecially in him, who, as he is the Lord of rational creatures, ſo he cannot but be their judge. Whoever therefore ſays, that any is unjuſt, or not juſt, denies ſuch to be God, of whom he thus ſpeaks.

XXXIII. The latter I make out thus. Whatever is the righteous judgment of God, that the juſtice of God requires ſhould be done: it is neceſſary, that God do himſelf juſtice; who, properly ſpeaking, owes nothing to any one, but to himſelf. As that is *the judgment* (righteouſneſs) *of the law*,† which the law demands,

* Job. xxxiv. 10. † Rom. viii. 4.

and which without juſtice cannot be denied the law; the judgment of God is what the law requires, and cannot be denied him, unleſs he would be unjuſt to himſelf. But it is *the judgment of God, that they which do evil, are worthy of death.** Therefore there is a connection between ſin and the deſert of death, not only in virtue of the will, but alſo of the juſtice of God. Moreover, as *the judgment of* God *is always according to truth,*† he muſt pronounce the perſon who is worthy of death, worthy of it, and unworthy of life, conſequently condemn him, unleſs a ſatisfaction intervene. To act otherwiſe, would be unworthy the juſt God. The apoſtle intimates this,‡ declaring, that *God hath ſet forth Chriſt to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteouſneſs, that he might be juſt, and the juſtifier of him which believeth in Jeſus.* By which words he ſhews, if God ſhould juſtify the ungodly, and admit him to happineſs without the atonement of the blood of Chriſt, he would not be juſt, at leaſt his juſtice would not be diſplayed.

XXXIV. Memorable eſpecially is that which God ſays in Jeremiah,§ *Shall I not viſit for theſe things? ſaith the Lord: ſhall not my ſoul be avenged on ſuch a nation as this?* The meaning is, ſhall I be Jehovah, and ſhall I not deny myſelf, if I bear with thoſe things in my people? Nay, if there be any ſuch a nation, ſhall I not puniſh it? It is impoſſible I ſhould do this, and that in virtue of *my ſoul*, that is of my very eſſential holineſs and Deity. Should I have a divine *ſoul*, that is, a divine *nature*, and juſt, and not be avenged of ſin? For *the ſoul* of God denotes *the moſt holy nature* of God, or, which is the ſame, *the eſſential holineſs* of God. As

* Rom. i. 32. † Rom. ii. 2. ‡ Rom. iii. 25, 26.
§ Chap. ix. 9. 29.

appears from comparing Amos iv. 2. with Amos vi. 8. In the former it is said, *The Lord hath sworn by his holiness:* in the latter, *The Lord hath sworn* BENAPHSHO *by* (his soul) *himself.*

XXXV. Crellius therefore trifles,* when he ridiculously says, that to punish is God's foreign and strange work; as if to shew mercy was God's proper work, but to exact punishment, his strange work. To that end wresting Is. xxviii. 21. *that he may do his work*, which he translates, *his strange work: that he may work his work, foreign* (or strange) *is his work to him.* We frankly own, that, by that foreign and strange work, we ought to understand his vengeance against the rebellious Jews. But it is said to be strange and foreign, in a quite different sense from what this perverter of scripture would have it. It was *strange* and *foreign*, because altogether uncommon and extraordinary. For it was to be *a great tribulation, such as had not been since the beginning of the world to that time*, Math. xxiv. 21. Likewise, it might appear strange to any one, that God should do such a thing to a people in covenant with him, and loaded with so many benefits, examples equal to which he had not exhibited even among his enemies, who were strangers to his covenants, and with which could hardly be compared, what he had done in mount Perazim against the Philistines,† and in the valley of Gibeon.‡ And also, because such an extraordinary punishment from God (as strange and unusual things are wont to excite great emotions) would fill any with astonishment, so as they would be obliged to take notice of the hand of God in it. The miseries of the Jews struck Titus himself with horror; and, on viewing the walls and towers of Jerusalem, he confessed, that without

* De vera relig. l. i. c. 28. † 2 Sam. v. 21. ‡ Is. x. 10.

God, such a city could never have been taken. 'Tis very remarkable what Philostratus relates in the life of Apollonius Tyanæus.* When the neighbouring nations came according to custom, to offer crowns to Titus, to adorn himself with, for his conquest of the Jews: he said, "That he deserved no such honor; that he did not atchieve those things, but only WAS THE INSTRUMENT OF GOD, WHO WAS THEN DISPLAYING HIS WRATH." In like manner also, because it was strange and foreign to the Israelites; who, that the Romans might not come to destroy their city, brought upon themselves the guilt of that wickedness against the Lord Jesus, which was the cause of so great a destruction to them. It was therefore strange and foreign, not to God (for the text says no such thing) but in itself and to men. Or if we would say, that it was altogether strange and foreign to God; it must be meant, because God delights not in the destruction of his creatures, as such, but (to speak after the manner of men) is rather inclined to acts of goodness and mercy. But this is so far from being of service to the heretic, that, on the contrary it furnishes us with a new and solid argument: which I thus form.

XXXVI. Fourthly, It is certain, that penal evil, as such, is not in itself desirable, even to God, because it is connected with the destruction of his own work. *Is it good unto thee, that thou shouldst oppress; that thou shouldst despise the work of thine hands?*† Nay, God confirms by an inviolable oath, that *he has no pleasure in the death of the wicked.*‡ It must then be something else which renders it desirable, and so much so, that God declares, that *he exults* in it, and *derives* great *consolation* from it, as being that alone which can, as it

* Lib. v. c. 14. † Job x. 3. ‡ Ezek. xxxiii. 11.

were, be sufficient to mitigate his grief, and appease his indignation, occasioned by sin. Nothing can be imagined stronger than the scripture-phrases on this subject, some of which I shall exhibit. *It is* IN MY DESIRE, *that I should chastise them.** *That* REFRESHES HIMSELF *by desolation (strengtheneth the spoiled) against the strong.*† *The Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you.*‡ *I will ease me of my adversaries, and avenge me of my enemies.*§ God, you see, desires to punish sinners. When he pours out desolation upon them, he refreshes himself; nor slightly only, but he both rejoices and exults; and that with such a joy, as may be proper for mitigating the pain, caused by sin, and consequently of yielding consolation to God. What is it which makes that evil of the creature so desirable to the Creator? What other, but that, by inflicting punishment, he preserves inviolable the glory of his supremacy, holiness, and justice, which sin would wholly obscure? For all the usefulness of punishment (as Crellius himself speaks) "must needs regard God." But we can conceive here no advantage redounding to God, unless his rejoicing in the declaration of his glory, shining forth in that judgment, the justice of which the holy angels acknowledge with applause,‖ and even the damned themselves, though unwilling and gnashing their teeth, are constrained to confess. It is indeed impossible, that God should set light by this his most excellent glory, of which he is so jealous. Since then it is necessary, that God should prefer the destruction of his depraved creature to that of his own glory, it is as necessary, that he should punish the wicked creature. God indeed loves his creatures, but he does, as he ought, much more himself. He would act inconsistent with that love of

* Hos. x. 10. † Amos v. 9. ‡ Deut. xxviii. 36. § Is. i. 24.
‖ Rev. xi. 17. and Rev. xvi. 5, 6.

himself, if he should not recover his glory, which his sinful creature has, by horrible sacrilege, robbed him of, by inflicting punishment upon it.

XXXVII. Fifthly and lastly, We shall use arguments *ad hominem*. Socinus owns,* "that not to pardon the impenitent, is certainly right, and agreeable to THE DIVINE NATURE, and consequently to rectitude and equity." Crellius, in like manner, says,† "that it is unworthy of God to suffer the crimes of the obstinate to escape unpunished." Let us a little examine these concessions. They say, it is "unworthy of God, not to punish the obstinate:" nay, "it is due to the nature of God," not to pardon them. Why, pray? Is it because they are stubborn and obstinate? But obstinacy is not punished on its own account, because there is a good and laudable obstinacy, or constancy. It is therefore only punished, because of the evil that is in it. Wherefore it is necessary, that sin be punished on its own account, and obstinacy only because of the sinfulness of it. And if it be necessary to punish sin on its own account, therefore, where-ever it is to be met with, it must necessarily be punished. Add to this, that all men, after having once sinned, obstinately persevere in sin, unless they are brought to repentance by the preventing grace of God. But how can they obtain this without a previous satisfaction, if it be a debt which the divine nature owes to itself, not to grant them pardon?

XXXVIII. We likewise readily admit what Crellius advances in the very same chapter: "By the same claim of right that we owe obedience to God, by the same also we become liable to punishment for neglect of obedience and service: for punishment succeeds, as it were, in the place of the duty omitted, and, if possible, ought to atone for it." But doubtless, by a claim of

* De servato, p. i. c. 1. † De vera relig. lib. i. c. 23.

natural right, obedience is due to God; and it would be repugnant to the divine perfections, for God not to require it of a rational nature. I speak without reserve: A God who cannot demand obedience from his rational creature, is not God. And the very same thing, according to Crellius's very just hypothesis, is to be affirmed of punishment. I am well aware, that Crellius founds both claims, as well to obedience as to punishment, on the dominion of God as Lord; though this ought rather to be founded on the natural majesty and supremacy of God, which is the foundation of this sovereign dominion. But he is forced to confess, that this sovereign dominion is so natural to God, that he cannot renounce it; nay indeed, that "without it, it is scarce intelligible, how he can be God; since it is on account of that very authority, and the power from which it flows, he is said to be God." It therefore stands firm, that the penal sanction of the covenant is founded in the super-eminent, most holy, and most just nature of God, and not in the mere good pleasure of the free divine will only.

XXXIX. Moreover, it might be here inquired, whether the eternity of punishment ought to be derived from this natural right of God; or, which is the same thing, whether a punishment, justly equivalent to every sin, ought necessarily to be eternal, according to God's natural right; so that to maintain the contrary, would be unworthy of God, and consequently impossible. A difficult question this, and the rather, because to determine concerning this absolute right of God, in special cases, seems to be above human reach. *God is greater than man; he giveth not an account of his matters.** Let us, however, try, whether, from the consideration of

* Job xxxiii. 12, 13.

the divine perfections, we may not gather, what may in this caſe be worthy of God.

XL. I now preſuppoſe, that there is in ſin committed againſt the infinite majeſty of God, a malignity *in its meaſure* infinite, and therefore a demerit of puniſhment *in its meaſure* infinite alſo. I ſay, that there is in ſin a malignity only *in its meaſure* infinite. For it cannot be called infinite in an *abſolute* ſenſe. If you conſider the entity of the act in itſelf, an act infinitely intenſe cannot be elicited by a finite creature: if the irregularity, and the privation of moral good adhering to the act, it is a privation of a finite rectitude, ſuch as can be competent to a creature: if, in fine, you conſider the whole complex, namely, ſin, in the concrete, as they ſpeak; neither in that caſe is its malignity abſolutely infinite. For all vicious acts are not equal, but there is a great diſparity among them; which could not be unequal, if they were infinite. However, the malignity of ſin is *in its meaſure* infinite: 1. *Objectively*, becauſe it is committed againſt an infinite good. 2. *Extenſively*, in reſpect of duration, becauſe the blot or ſtain of ſin endures for ever, unleſs it be purged away by the blood of Chriſt. And therefore there is in him a deſert of puniſhment, not abſolutely infinite, as to intenſeneſs of torments. (1.) Becauſe ſuch a puniſhment is abſolutely impoſſible; for a finite creature is not capable of infinite torments. (2.) Becauſe it would follow, that God could never ſatisfy his juſtice, by inflicting condign puniſhment on the wicked, ſeeing they are incapable of this puniſhment. Now, it is then abſurd to ſay, that any puniſhment is of right due to ſin, which God could never inflict. (3.) Becauſe it would follow, that an equal puniſhment was due to all ſins, or that all in fact were to be puniſhed alike: which is an abſurdity, and againſt Math. xi. 22, 24. The reaſon

of this conſequence is, becauſe there neither is, nor can be any diſparity between infinites. Nevertheleſs there is in ſin a deſert of puniſhment *in its meaſure* infinite; namely, in the ſame manner that the malignity of it is infinite. That is, 1. *Objectively*, ſo as to deprive man of the enjoyment of the infinite good, which is God. 2. *Extenſively*, ſo that the puniſhment ſhall laſt for ever. And thus I conſider this deſert of eternal puniſhment ſo far only as to conclude, that God does nothing contrary to equity and juſtice, when he puniſhes the ſins of men with eternal torments both of ſoul and body. Which the event ſhews, as I have made appear above, § 17.

XLI. But I know not, if it can be determined, whether this eternity ought neceſſarily to conſiſt in the puniſhment *of ſenſe*, or whether the juſtice of God may be ſatisfied by the eternal puniſhment *of loſs*, in the annihilation of the ſinful creature. This, I apprehend, may be ſaid with ſufficient probability and ſobriety: If God ſhall be pleaſed to continue in exiſtence for ever, the ſinful creature, it is neceſſary (without a ſatisfaction) that he for ever inflict puniſhment on him, not only the puniſhment of loſs, but likewiſe that of ſenſe. The reaſon is, becauſe not only the guilt of ſin always remains; but alſo the ſtain with which ſin, once committed, infects the ſoul, and which can never be purged out but by the blood of Chriſt. But it is impoſſible, as we proved, § 22, 23, 24. that God ſhould admit man ſtained with ſin, to communion with himſelf: and it cannot be, that a rational creature, excluded the enjoyment of the divine favor, ſhould not feel this indignation of God with the deepeſt anguiſh. Conſcience moſt ſeverely laſhes the wretches for having ſquandered away the chief good. Which with no ſmall care we have alſo ſhewn, § 13. and the following ſections.

XLII. But whether it be neceſſary, that God ſhould preſerve for ever the ſinful creature in a ſtate of exiſtence, I own I am ignorant. May it not, in its meaſure, be reckoned an infinite puniſhment, if God ſhould pleaſe to doom man, who was by nature a candidate for eternity, to total annihilation, from whence he ſhould never be ſuffered to return to life? I know, God has now determined otherwiſe, and that with the higheſt juſtice. But it is queried, whether, agreeably to his juſtice, he might not have ſettled it in this manner: If thou O man, ſinneſt, I will fruſtrate thy deſire of eternal happineſs, and of a bleſſed eternity, and, on the contrary, give thee up to eternal annihilation? Here at leaſt let us ſtop.

CHAP. VI.

Of the Sacraments of the Covenant of Works.

IT hath pleaſed the bleſſed and almighty God, in every diſpenſation of his covenants, to confirm, by ſome ſacred *ſymbols*, the certainty of his promiſes, and, at the ſame time, to remind man, in covenant with him, of his duty: to which ſymbols eccleſiaſtical practice has long ſince given the name of *Sacraments*. This was certainly appointed with an excellent deſign, by the all-wiſe God. For, 1. What God has made known concerning his covenant, is, by this means, propoſed to man's more accurate conſideration: ſince he has not only once and again been inſtructed in the will of God by a heavenly oracle, but frequently, and almoſt daily, beholds with his eyes thoſe things, which, by heaven,

are granted him as pledges of the greateſt bleſſings. What believers ſee with their eyes, uſually ſink deeper into the ſoul, and leave clearer impreſſions of themſelves, than thoſe only which they hear with their ears. Elegantly to this purpoſe ſays Herodotus,* *Men uſually give leſs credit to the ears than to the eyes.* 2. Theſe ſymbols alſo tend to confirm our faith. For though nothing can be thought of that deſerves more credit than the word of God; yet where God adds ſigns and ſeals to his infalliable promiſes, he gives a twofold foundation to our faith. Thus *he more abundantly ſhews unto the heirs of promiſe the immutability of his counſel: that by two immutable things, in which it was impoſſible for God to lie, we might have a ſtrong conſolation.*† 3. By means of this inſtitution, a holy man does, by the ſight, touch, and taſte of the ſacred ſymbols, attain to ſome ſenſe of eternal bleſſings, and accuſtoms himſelf, under the ſymbols, to a contemplation and foretaſte of theſe things, to the plenary and immediate fruition of which he will, one time or other, be admitted without any outward ſigns. 4. The man has in theſe ſomething continually to remind him of his duty: and as, from time to time, they preſent to his thoughts, and give him a prelibation of his Creator, ſo at the ſame time they refreſh his memory with thoſe very ſtrong obligations, by which he is bound to his covenant-God. And thus they are both a bridle to reſtrain him from ſin, and a ſpur to quicken him cheerfully to run that holy race, which he has happily entered upon.

II. God alſo granted to man ſuch ſymbols under the covenant of works; concerning which we are now to ſpeak, that nothing may be wanting in this treatiſe: and, if I miſtake not, there were four in all, which I reckon

* Lib. i. † Heb. vi. 17, 18.

up in this order. 1. PARADISE. 2. THE TREE OF LIFE. 3. THE TREE OF KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL. 4. THE SABBATH. In ſpeaking of each of theſe, I ſhall diſtinctly ſhew, Firſt, What good they ſignified and ſealed to man, with reſpect to God. Secondly, What duty and obligation they reminded him of.

III. But I think it previouſly neceſſary to obſerve, that it is altogether foreign to this treatiſe, and out of its place, to propoſe ſuch ſignifications either of paradiſe, or of the tree of life, or of the Sabbath, as relate to the goſpel, the grace of Chriſt, and to glory as freely given to the elect by the Mediator and Spirit of grace. Here I obſerve, that men otherwiſe great have ſtumbled, who, when explaining the nature of thoſe ſacraments, too uncautiouſly blend things belonging to a quite different covenant. Nothing is here to be brought in, which does not belong to the covenant of works, the promiſes of that covenant, and the duties of man under the ſame: all which are moſt diſtinct from the covenant of grace. Here we are to ſay nothing of Chriſt, nothing of juſtifying faith in him, nothing of our ceaſing from our own works as impure, nor any thing of that *reſt* after the miſeries of this life. All theſe belong to another covenant. I do not indeed refuſe, that the unſearchable wiſdom of God did appoint and order theſe ſymbols in ſuch a manner, that the remembrance of them, after the fall, might be able to inſtruct man in many things relating to the covenant of grace, and its Mediator. Thus, according to Paul, we obſerve in the firſt Adam, a type of the ſecond; in Eve curiouſly formed out of Adam's rib while aſleep, a type of the church, as it were, taken from Chriſt in virtue of his death; and in the firſt marriage a great myſtery, which regards Chriſt and the church. Theſe things, however, were neither

known to nor thought of by Adam in the ſtate of nature; nor are they to be mentioned in a diſcourſe on the ſacraments of the covenant of works. Having premiſed theſe things, let us now inquire into each particular with all the care poſſible, beginning with paradiſe.

IV. It is far from our deſign, elaborately to inquire into the ſituation and topography of *paradiſe*. Let it ſuffice to obſerve, that it was a garden, and a moſt agreeable incloſure, planted by God himſelf, toward the eaſt, in Eden, a moſt fertile region, and abounding in all kinds of delights, as very learned men think, near Haran, the mart of Arabia, at the conflux of the Euphrates and Tigris, not far from Meſopotamia. Which was watered with four rivers, waſhing, by many windings and meanders, the moſt fertile orchard. When man was formed from the earth without paradiſe, he was introduced by God as a new gueſt into this place, with deſign that he might afterwards give an account of his ſtewardſhip and care. Here he wanted nothing that could contribute to the proper pleaſures of this life, God frequently revealing himſelf to man, and familiarly admitting him to the ſweeteſt fellowſhip with himſelf. Moſes alſo mentions the gold and the precious ſtones of that country, as of the beſt kind, and in the greateſt plenty. What now was the meaning and myſtical ſignification of all theſe things?

V. Firſt, In general, the pleaſantneſs of this place, every moment ſetting before man the moſt profuſe bounty of the Deity, and exhibiting the ſame to the enjoyment of all his ſenſes, aſſured him, that he was to expect another reſidence far more noble and grand; where he ſhould not, as now, enjoy his God through and in the creatures, but immediately delight in his Creator, to his being fully ſatisfied with his likeneſs. For, if God now conferred upon him ſuch things while on his

journey, and before the courſe of his appointed trial was finiſhed; what might he not, nay what ought he not to promiſe himſelf from that immenſe munificence, after having acted his part well, with the boldneſs of aſking his moſt ample recompenſe, he had acquired the right of approaching his rewarder? Was not the Lord, amidſt this abundance, that lacked nothing pertaining to this animal life, frequently addreſſing him, How ſhall I one day place thee among my ſons, if thou conſtantly continueſt obedient to my voice? If there is ſo much ſweetneſs in theſe created rivulets of my goodneſs, in which now thou ſwimmeſt with ſo much pleaſure; what will there not be in myſelf, the unexhauſted fountain, and the moſt plentiful ſpring? Aſcend, O man, by the ſcale of the creatures, to Me the Creator, and, from a foretaſte of theſe firſt-fruits, conclude, what I have prepared for thee againſt that time, when I myſelf ſhall be *thy exceeding great reward*. And certainly, unleſs we ſuppoſe Adam to have been ſtupid, and devoid of all divine light, he could not but have ſuch thoughts.

VI. The ſcripture declares, that by paradiſe is ſignified the ſeat of perfect bliſs, when it calls heaven, the habitation of the bleſſed, by the name of *paradiſe*.* A manner of expreſſion commonly uſed by the Holy Ghoſt, by which the names of the ſign, and the thing ſignified, of the type and antitype, are mutually exchanged. The Jews themſelves ſaw this, with whom it is uſual to call the place of abſolutely perfect happineſs, NGEDÆN and GAN NGEDÆN, *Eden* and *the garden of* Eden; and no wiſh was more frequent among them, than this, *Let his reſt*, that is, the place of his reſt, *be Eden*. There is alſo a moſt ſuitable analogy between paradiſe and heaven, which we are now more expreſsly and particularly to ſhew.

* Luke xxiii. 43. 2 Cor. xii. 4.

VII. 1. Paradiſe was a garden planted by God himſelf, to be the reſidence of man formed after the divine image. Heaven is a place made and prepared by the ſame God for the eternal abode of man, after he has added conſtancy to his other virtues, and ſo has in himſelf the full image of God, where his holineſs ſhall be unchangeable. As therefore it was incumbent on man to acknowledge the hand and moſt munificent bounty of his God in this terreſtrial habitation; ſo he was ſtill far more evidently to experience the ſame in the celeſtial abode of his heavenly Father. 2. Paradiſe exceedingly ſurpaſſed all the other parts of the earth, in reſpect to the pleaſantneſs of it; for it was planted in Eden, a place of all kinds of delight. Whence the moſt pleaſant countries in the world are ſaid to be *as the garden of God.** And Ezekiel, propheſying of the future extraordinary plenty of the earth, ſays, that the earth, which before that was lying waſte, ſhould be as *the garden of Eden.*† And what is grander than that promiſe of Iſaiah, *For the Lord ſhall comfort Zion; he will comfort all her waſte places, and he will make her wilderneſs like Eden, and her deſert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladneſs ſhall be found therein, thankſgiving, and the voice of melody?*‡ From which words it is clear, that nothing was wanting in paradiſe, in its primitive ſtate, to give the completeſt pleaſure to man. But much leſs will any thing be wanting in heaven to the moſt abſolutely perfect happineſs. The pleaſures of which will far more exceed thoſe of this terreſtrial garden, than heaven itſelf, exceeds the earth in its height. For paradiſe had thoſe things, which diſcovered its imperfection, ſuch as thoſe that belonged to this animal life, all which will be wholly excluded heaven, where *is fulneſs of joys*, SOBANG

* Gen. xiii. 10. † Chap. xxxvi. 35. ‡ Chap. li. 3.

SOMACHOTH.* 3. In paradiſe flowed the moſt limpid ſtreams, watering and fertilizing the garden, where-ever it was neceſſary. In heaven there is *a pure river of water of life, clear as cryſtal, proceeding out of the throne of God.*† By which circumlocution are ſignified the gifts of the Holy Spirit, a few drops of which are indeed granted here, but with which the bleſſed will be intoxicated to a perfect joy. 4. Moſes alſo mentions gold, bdellium, and the onyx-ſtone, which were found in that region.‡ In heaven there will be ſpiritual treaſures, with which no gold, no topaz, nor any of the precious ſtones of the whole earth, can any wiſe be compared. 5. In paradiſe there were trees, both beautiful and uſeful. In heaven there are precious things, both pleaſant to the ſight, and excellent for uſe. Above all, there were the two trees, of knowledge and of life. But in the heavenly kingdom, there is true and perfect knowledge, and that life which is really and emphatically ſo. 6. Man being firſt created in the earth, was tranſlated into paradiſe, as the better reſidence. For, if I miſtake not, the words of Moſes intimate this, *And there he put the man whom he had formed.*§ Compare Gen. iii. 23, where, after his ſin, he is ſaid to be *ſent forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground, from whence he was taken.* In like manner alſo, man was in due time to be tranſlated from that natural and animal ſtate, in which he was created, to another altogether ſupernatural and heavenly: of which this deſirable tranſlation from earth to paradiſe reminded him; which Zanchius alſo obſerved on Gen. ii. 15. as alſo Muſculus. 7. Had not man been innocent, he would have had no place in paradiſe. This garden did not bear him when once tainted with ſin. So *nothing that defileth can enter into heaven.*‖ That is, *the*

* Pſal. xvi. 11. † Rev. xxii. 1. ‡ Gen. ii. 11, 12. § Gen. ii. 8. ‖ Rev. xxi. 27.

*habitation of God's holineſs and glory.** 8. In paradiſe man enjoyed the familiar fellowſhip of his God: and in this ſenſe paradiſe might alſo be ſtyled *the garden of God*, as God dwelt there, delighting himſelf in the work of his hands, and eſpecially in man himſelf; to whom as it was a pleaſure to man to be thus near and familiar, ſo it was a delight to God. But in heaven the habitation of his majeſty, God will be always preſent with man, and give himſelf, in the moſt familiar manner poſſible, to be ſeen and enjoyed by him.

VIII. As paradiſe was ſuited to ſet forth all theſe things to man, ſo, in like manner, the uſe of this pledge reminded him of ſeveral duties. And firſt, he hence learned, that he ought not to ſeek for his good and felicity in any thing upon earth, which, when appearnig even moſt perfect, diſcovers its own imperfections; ſuch as this animal life in paradiſe, that was to be recruited continually with meat, drink, and a ſucceſſion of ſleeping and waking. By which means he was taught to aſpire after a greater happineſs, namely, the immediate fruition of his God; in the ſeeking after which happineſs, the principal holineſs of a traveller conſiſts. For you love God above all things, if you ardently pant after an intimate union with him.

IX. Secondly, Since this paradiſe was given to man to be cultivated and kept, the Lord thereby reminded him, that he took no pleaſure in a lazy idleneſs, but in an active induſtry. His will was, that man ſhould employ his labour and care upon the garden, that he might have ſomething to do, and in which he might continually experience the goodneſs and providence of his Creator. He did not chuſe, that angels themſelves ſhould be idle, whom he made miniſtering ſpirits. And ſo he

* Iſ. lxiv. 15.

aſſigned to man the care of cultivating and keeping paradiſe, that he might have ſomething to employ himſelf in the works of God; juſt as a king's ſon has ſome office aſſigned him, leſt he ſhould become indolent by an exceſs of pleaſures, honor, and riches. Thus he became obliged to be conformed to his God by the pureſt actings, and to be employed about the very work of God's hands, till he ſhould come to enjoy an eternal ſabbath with himſelf.

X. Thirdly, This alſo had a further reſpect to himſelf. For, 1. As paradiſe was the pledge of heaven, ſo the careful keeping of it reminded him to have heaven continually in his mind and thoughts. 2. The labour and culture of paradiſe taught him, that only *he that labours*, and does that which is acceptable to God, can get to the heavenly habitation. 3. He was alſo inſtructed to keep his ſoul for God, as a moſt pleaſant garden, cultivated like the paradiſe of God, and ſhew forth thoſe trees of virtues, which God planted, as producing the moſt excellent fruits, that is, works proceeding from good habits: that ſo the Lord might come into this his garden, *and eat his pleaſant fruits.** 4. It pointed out to him, that he ſhould, above all things, ſolicitouſly keep his ſoul, that garden of God, leſt any wild beaſts of depraved paſſions ſhould break in, to lay every thing therein waſte. And when God ſaid to him, Keep this my garden, may he not at the ſame time be ſuppoſed to ſay, *Keep thy heart with all diligence*, or above all keeping?† 5. The keeping of paradiſe impoſed an anxious ſolicitude upon him, not to do any thing againſt God, leſt, as a bad gardener being thruſt out of the garden, he ſhould in that diſcern a melancholy ſymbol of his own

* Cant. iv. 16. † Prov. iv. 23.

excluſion from heaven. We then conclude, that man, being with joy and exultation admitted into paradiſe, was bound, and was willing to be bound, to perform all theſe things to God, and ſo upon entering into paradiſe, bound himſelf, as by a ſacrament, to theſe duties.

XI. Now follows the conſideration of the TREE OF LIFE: but whether *a ſingle tree*, or *an entire ſpecies of trees*, is a queſtion among the learned. Some think that the former, which is indeed the common opinion, is founded on no probable reaſon; and ſuppoſe it more ſuitable to the goodneſs of God, that ſuch a beautiful and uſeful tree ſhould be in the view of his favorite, in as many parts of the incloſure as poſſible. They alſo alledge the divine benediction,* by which God conferred on all trees the virtue of multiplying themſelves. But they chiefly inſiſt on Rev. xxii. 2. where John pitches the tree of life on each ſide of the river, which they compare with Ezek. xlvii. 12. Others, on the contrary, do not think it probable, that it was an entire ſpecies: Firſt, becauſe the univerſal particle, KOL *all*, is not added as before, when Moſes would expreſs many things of the ſame ſpecies, or many ſpecies themſelves. Next, becauſe it is ſaid to have been placed in the middle of the garden, ſo as to have the other trees ſurrounding it in order. To the paſſages alledged from the Apocalypſe and Ezekiel, they anſwer, that John ſpeaks only in the ſingular number both in that place, and Rev. ii. 7. and that one tree could properly be ſaid to ſtand *in the midſt of the ſtreet*, and on both ſides of the river, becauſe the river run through the midſt of the ſtreet, and becauſe that ſingle tree extended its roots and branches to each ſide, ſo that there was no defect on either ſide. They likewiſe conclude from its being a

* Gen. i. 11, 12.

type, that it must be a single one; because Christ is one. But Ezekiel saw many on the bank of the river, representing the church militant; because though one Christ quickens the church, yet it is by several means he now communicates life to the elect. These are the arguments on both sides. If any should desire our judgment, we are of opinion, that the arguments of neither side have the force of a demonstration; but, from the consideration of its being a type, we rather incline to the more common opinion.

XII. Whether this tree was endued with a singular virtue above others, so as to restore with equal perfection the moisture consumed by the excessive heat, perfectly to cure the disorders of the body, who can certainly tell? who can obstinately deny? To ascribe to it a medical virtue against diseases, does not appear suitable to the state of innocent man. For diseases and sickly infirmities are only the effects of sin. But nothing sure is more ridiculous, than that paradoxical and altogether untheological assertion of Socinus, that Adam, by the benefit of that food, would have prolonged his life to a much longer period than God chose he should, had he not been deprived of the opportunity of reaching forth his hand to that tree. As if God when he expelled man out of paradise, and said, *Lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and live for ever*,* was apprehensive, that man, upon tasting again of that tree, should live for ever, notwithstanding his will and threatening; which is downright blasphemy. For, by these words, God only intended to restrain the vain thoughts of man, now become such a fool, as to imagine that, by the use of that tree, he could repair the loss he had sustained by sin; or, as if the bare use of

* Gen. iii. 22.

the ſacrament, or the *opus operatum*, as it is called, could be of any advantage, without the thing ſignified. And, by driving man from that outward ſign of immortality, he cut him off from all hopes of ſalvation by that covenant, of which that tree was a ſymbol. However, there muſt be ſome great reaſon, why that tree obtained this deſignation: which we will now inquire into.

XIII. The tree of life ſignified the Son of God, not indeed as he is Chriſt and Mediator (that conſideration being peculiar to another covenant) but in as much as he is the life of man in every condition, and the fountain of all happineſs. O how well was it ſpoken by one, who ſaid, that it became God from the firſt to repreſent by an outward ſign, that perſon whom he loves, and for whoſe glory he has made and does make all things; nay, *to whom he ſheweth all things that he doth, that he may alſo do likewiſe*,* as the author of life to man; that man, even then, might acknowledge him as ſuch; and afterwards, when he was to be manifeſted as his Saviour and Phyſician, Adam and his poſterity might bring him to remembrance, as exhibited by a ſymbol at the very beginning! As in fact it has happened, that they who believe Moſes, the prophets, and the goſpel, avow, that in the beginning there was no life but in him, for whoſe glory to be diſplayed in the work of ſalvation, the earth was alſo made. Wherefore Chriſt is called *the Tree of Life*.† What indeed he now is by his merit and efficacy as Mediator, he would have always been as the Son of God, of the ſame ſubſtance with his Father. For as by him man was created, and obtained an animal life, ſo, in like manner, he would have been tranſformed by him and bleſſed with a heavenly life. Nor could he have been the life of the ſinner, as Mediator, unleſs he

* John v. 19. † Rev. xxii. 2.

had likewiſe been the life of man in his holy ſtate as God; having life in himſelf, and being life itſelf.

XIV. The fruit of this tree, charming all the ſenſes with its unparallelled beauty, ſignified the pleaſures of divine love, with which happy man was one day to be fully regaled, and which never cloy, but, with their ſweet variety, do always quicken the appetite. In this ſenſe, wiſdom is ſaid to be *a tree of life to them that lay hold of her.** Becauſe the ſtudy and practice of true wiſdom fills the ſoul with an ineffable pleaſure.

XV. Moreover, it was man's duty, 1. Attentively to conſider this tree, *as pleaſant to the eyes*,† and to contemplate therein the perfections of the Son of God, whoſe brighteſt viſion was one day to complete his happineſs. 2. By the uſe and enjoyment of this tree, to teſtify his communion with the Son of God, and acknowledge him as the author of the life he longed for; which, though innocent, he was to ſeek after, not in himſelf, but in God, as a liberal rewarder. 3. He himſelf, in imitation of the Son of God, and as in communion with him, ought to be as a tree of life to his wife and poſterity, by giving them holy adviſe and example, as a plant of the garden of God, a partaker of the divine life, and as miniſtering to the life of his neighbour. *The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life.*‡

XVI. Beſides the tree of life, Moſes ſpeaks of another tree, deriving its name from THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOOD AND EVIL, concerning whoſe name and uſe we began to ſpeak, chap. iii. § 20, 21. That it was deſigned for man's probation, is undoubted: but whether it was alſo a ſymbol of the covenant, is diſputed. I freely own, I ſee no reaſon why this ſhould be denied. For all the requiſites to conſtitute a ſymbol of a cove-

* Prov. iii. 18. † Gen. iii. 6. ‡ Prov. xi. 30.

nant here concur. We have an external and visible sign, instituted by God: we have the thing signified, together with a beautiful analogy: we have, in fine, a memorial of man's duty: all which fully constitute the nature of a sacred symbol, or sacrament.

XVII. The *external sign* was a certain tree *in the midst of the garden, good for food, pleasant to the eyes, and to be desired to make one wise.** The use of this sign was twofold. 1. That it might be attentively viewed and considered by man, while he carefully meditates on the mystical signification of this tree. For that end it was so beautiful and so desirable to the view, and placed in the midst of the garden, where man most frequently resorted. 2. That, from a religious obedience, he should abstain from eating of it, thereby acknowledging God's absolute dominion over him, and his expectation of another world, in which he should be forbid nothing truly desirable.

XVIII. The *thing signified* was in like manner twofold, the *sealing* both of the *promise* and the *threatening* of the covenant. For its being called *the tree of knowledge of good*, intimated, that man, if from a principle of love he obeyed this probationary precept, should come to the knowledge, sense, and fruition of that good which is truly and excellently so, and the full knowledge of which is only obtainable by sense and enjoyment. On the other hand, when called *the tree of the knowledge of evil*, thereby is signified, that man, if found disobedient, should be doomed to the greatest calamity, the exceeding evil and wretchedness of which he should at last know by experience. And even they who, in other respects, would not have this tree called a symbol of the divine covenant, do confess this.

* Gen. iii. 3. 6.

XIX. There was here a very plain memorial of duty. For this tree taught, 1. That man was ſincerely to contemplate and deſire the chief good; but not to endeavour after it, unleſs in the manner and way preſcribed by heaven; nor here to give into his own reaſonings, how plauſible ſoever they might appear. 2. That man's happineſs was not to be placed in things pleaſing to the ſenſes of the body; and that there is another and a quite different beatifying good, which can ſatiate the ſoul, and is of itſelf ſufficient to the conſummation of happineſs. 3. That God was the moſt abſolute Lord of man, whoſe ſole will, expreſſed by his law, ſhould be the ſupreme rule and directory of all the appetites of the ſoul, and of all the motions of the body. 4. That there is no attaining to a life of true happineſs, but by perfect obedience. 5. That even man in innocence was to behave with a certain religious awe, when converſing with his God, leſt he ſhould fall into ſin. To theſe add what we have already obſerved, chap. iii. § 21.

XX. That very accurate and great divine Hieronymus Zanchius, after giving a hiſtory of theſe trees, expreſſes their myſtical ſignification in theſe words: "Moreover, theſe two trees in the midſt of paradiſe, and near each other, were very evident types of the law and goſpel, or of Chriſt. The law declares what is good, and what is evil: Chriſt is the true and eternal life. Both were in the midſt of paradiſe, becauſe the law and Chriſt, in the midſt of the church, are always to be propoſed to the ſons of Adam. One near the other, becauſe the law leads to Chriſt."* I cannot fully expreſs, what reverent thoughts I have of this great divine, whoſe commentaries I exceedingly prefer to thoſe newfangled comments, with which the minds of

* De creat. hom. lib. i. c. 1. §

ſtudents are at this day diſtracted and led aſtray. Nevertheleſs, theſe expreſſions ſeem to be more ingenious, than ſolid and judicious. For, under the covenant of works, Adam neither had, nor was it neceſſary he ſhould have, any ſacraments which reſpected Chriſt, the goſpel, and grace. This, however, may be ſaid in excuſe of theſe and the like things, which often occur even in the moſt learned authors, that though theſe things were not propoſed at firſt to man in innocence, in order to repreſent to him the grace of Chriſt, yet they were ſo wiſely ordered by God, that man, by reflecting upon them, could, after the fall, diſcover in them ſome dark reſemblance of thoſe things, which God afterwards, by a new promiſe, was pleaſed to reveal.

XXI. Other learned men have not thought proper to reckon the tree of knowledge among the ſymbols and ſeals of the covenant of works; being chiefly ſwayed to this opinion by the following reaſons. 1. Becauſe all ſacraments are given for uſe; but man was forbid the uſe of this tree. 2. Becauſe ſacraments are ſigns of a bleſſing, which they ſeal to thoſe who uſe them in a proper way; but this tree ſealed no bleſſing to any who ſhould uſe it, but rather brought a curſe upon that uſe. Theſe conſiderations, however, are not of that weight that we ſhould therefore depart from the more received opinion. And it is eaſy to anſwer both theſe arguments, not only from the truth of the thing itſelf, but alſo from the very hypotheſis of theſe learned men.

XXII. It is indeed true, that all ſacraments were given for uſe; but it is alſo certain, that the external uſe of all ſacraments is not after one and the ſame manner. All are not granted to the mouth and palate. There are ſacraments, whoſe uſe conſiſts in the contemplation of the ſign, and meditation on the thing ſignified. Some learned writers maintain, that the rainbow

was not a ſymbol only of the œcumenical or general covenant with the whole earth, but alſo of the covenant of grace in Chriſt; and they think, that the colours of the rainbow, the red, the fiery, and the green, denote, that, by blood, holineſs and mercy are united. But we can conceive no other ſacramental uſe of the rainbow, beſides the contemplation of it. In like manner, they place the brazen ſerpent among the ſacraments of the Old Teſtament, whoſe uſe conſiſted only in the beholding of it. Nay, they are of opinion concerning the tree of life itſelf, that it was not promiſcuouſly to be uſed by man, ſince *to him alone that overcometh, it is given to eat of the tree of life.** "Whence," ſay they, "it does not appear that Adam touched it before the fall: nay, the contrary is rather evident." And yet they ſay, that it was the firſt and moſt ancient repreſentation of the Son of God, and of the life to be poſſeſſed through him. Nothing then hinders the tree of knowledge from being alſo called a ſymbol of the covenant, though propoſed only to be looked at by man, though he was never to eat of it.

XXIII. I go a ſtep farther, and ſay, that there is no abſurdity, ſhould ſuch a ſacrament be appointed, whoſe uſe ſhould conſiſt in a religious abſtinence. Nor ſhould thoſe learned men, if conſiſtent with themſelves, be averſe to this opinion. "The deluge," ſay they, "from which Noah was preſerved, muſt needs be reckoned among the types." Now, the uſe of the waters, in reſpect to Noah, conſiſted in this, that they were neither to touch him and his, to their hurt; nor force themſelves into the ark, in which he was ſhut up: as the waters of the *Red ſea* likewiſe ſignified the ſame thing,

* Rev. ii. 7.

in the ſame manner, to Iſrael. Nay, what may ſeem juſtly ſtrange, theſe learned men ſay, that the firſt ſacrament of the covenant of grace was, "the ejectment of Adam out of paradiſe, and the barring up his acceſs to the tree of life:" or, as one is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf, The firſt ſacrament was the tree of life, which, though at firſt it regarded the covenant of works, and excluſion from it was the puniſhment of fallen man: nevertheleſs, that very excluſion was, at the ſame time, a ſign of the grace and goodneſs of God." I would beg of thoſe very learned men, to explain to me in what the ſacramental uſe of the tree of life was to have conſiſted under the covenant of grace, after man was expelled paradiſe, and that tree was no longer to be in his view. There is here no other uſe but a myſtical abſtinence and deprivation. And thus, we imagine, we have fully anſwered the firſt argument.

XXIV. Let us now conſider the ſecond: and we ſay, it is not inconſiſtent with the nature of ſacraments, to ſeal death and condemnation, to thoſe who unduly and irregularly uſe them. For ſince the covenant of God with man is ratified, not only by the promiſes, but alſo by certain threatenings belonging to it, and ſacraments are the ſeals of the whole covenant, it ſeals alſo threatenings to the profane abuſers of them. When a man partakes of the ſacraments, he comes under an oath and curſe, and makes himſelf liable to puniſhment, if he deals treacherouſly. To ſay nothing of the ſacraments of the covenant of works, the very ſacraments of the covenant of grace, are *the ſavour of death unto death* to hypocrites and profane perſons, who, in the bread and wine of the euchariſt, *eat and drink damnation to themſelves.** But it is not true, that the tree of

* 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.

knowledge ſealed only death; for it alſo ſealed life and happineſs. It was the tree of knowledge, not only *of evil*, but *of good*. This, theſe learned men themſelves acknowledge, while they write, *that had Adam obeyed, he would, upon his trial, have come to the knowledge and ſenſe of his good, to which he was called, and had a natural deſire after; even eternal life and conſummate happineſs*. Whence we conclude, that, notwithſtanding theſe reaſonings, we may juſtly reckon the tree of knowledge among the ſacraments of the covenant of works.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Firſt Sabbath.

WE ſaid, that the firſt ſabbath was the fourth ſacrament of the covenant of works. In order to treat ſomewhat more fully on this, it will not be improper to make it the ſubject of a whole chapter. Moſes gives us the hiſtory of it in theſe words: *And on the ſeventh day God ended his work which he had made: and he reſted on the ſeventh day from all his work which he had made. And God bleſſed the ſeventh day, and ſanctified it; becauſe that in it he had reſted from all his work which God created and made.** The more fully to underſtand theſe words, and from them to anſwer our deſign, we ſhall diſtinctly diſcuſs theſe *three* things. 1. Inquire, whether what is here ſaid about *ſanctifying and bleſſing the ſeventh day*, ought to be applied to that *firſt* day, which immediately followed upon the ſix days of the creation, and which was the firſt that ſhone on the works of God

* Gen. ii. 2, 3.

when completed; or, whether it be neceſſary to have recourſe to an anticipation, by which we may look upon thoſe things as ſpoken of the day, on which, many ages after, the manna was given in the wilderneſs. 2. We ſhall explain the nature of that firſt ſabbath. 3. And laſtly, point out in what reſpect it was a ſacrament.

II. It is too well known to be mentioned, that the firſt of theſe points has been matter of great diſpute among divines, without coming to any determination to this day; nor do I chuſe to unravel what they have ſaid. I ſhall only obſerve, that perhaps the parties might eaſily agree, did we know, what we are to underſtand by *ſanctifying and bleſſing* the ſeventh day, mentioned by Moſes: and which we ſhall preſently conſider. But if we ſuppoſe in general, that God *reſted* on the ſeventh day from his work, that is, not only *deſiſted* from creating new ſpecies of creatures, but *acquieſced* and *took complacency* in the work which he had now finiſhed, eſpecially in man, who was formed after his image, and furniſhed with thoſe faculties, by which he was enabled to acknowledge and celebrate the perfections of God ſhining forth in his works; and that he ſet this his *reſting* before man as a pattern, by which he ſhould be taught to acquieſce in nothing but in God, for whom he was created; pleaſe himſelf in nothing but in glorifying God, which is the end of his creation: moreover, that he *ſanctified* this day, of which we are ſpeaking, by commanding it to be employed by man for that ſacred work, adding *a promiſe*, that all that time thus employed by man, ſhould be highly *bleſſed* to him: if, I ſay, we thus in general ſuppoſe, as all theſe things are evidently truth, there is good hope, that all equitable judges will allow, that we adhere to the ſimplicity of the letter, and interpret this hiſtory of Moſes, as the narrative of a

thing done at that time, which the holy prophet was then deſcribing.

III. I am glad to find the celebrated Cocceius aſſent to this. His words are theſe :* "Some imagine, that this verſe (namely 3.) is put by way of anticipation.—But it is not probable, that Moſes, in recording this bleſſing and ſanctification, did by any means ſpeak concerning the original ſabbath, but only concerning the Jewiſh ſabbath. This is plainly doing violence to the text, if one day be underſtood, which God bleſſed and ſanctified, and another, on which he reſted from his work." And the very eloquent Burman, though inclining to an anticipation, yet owns, that "the words of Moſes may be underſtood of that perpetual ſabbath, the ſeventh day after the creation, which firſt ſaw the works of God perfected, and moſt auſpiciouſly ſhone on the world, whence it is ſaid to be peculiarly bleſſed by God, and afterwards to be celebrated and ſanctified by man, for all ages to come."† See the ſame author, *de œconomia fœderum Dei*, § 208, 209. We ſhall ſay no more on this, as we could rather wiſh to ſee the orthodox agreeing among themſelves, than contending with one another. And indeed this muſt be acknowledged, if we would properly explain, in what manner this Sabbath was a ſacrament of the covenant of works.

IV. The beſt Hebrew authors, on whoſe authority thoſe of the oppoſite opinion are wont to build, agree with us in this diſpute. For in the Talmud they inquire, why man was created on the *evening of the ſabbath ;* and of the three reaſons they give, this is the laſt ; "that he might immediately enter on performing the command." The famous Ludovicus de Dieu, mentioning theſe words, on Gen. i. 27. adds, by way of

* In Gen. ii. § 6. † Synop. theol. lib. ii. c. 5. § 11.

explication; "For since the sabbath immediately succeeded the creation of man, he immediately entered on the command of sanctifying the sabbath." Baal Hatturim, after various interpretations of this passage, also subjoins this other; "In the hour, that he created the world, he blessed the sabbath and the world." Jarchi also mentions this opinion, though himself was otherwise minded; "What would the world have been without rest? On the coming of the sabbath came rest, and thus at length the work was finished and completed." By which he intimates, that the institution of the sabbath was joined to the completing of the works of God. There are also some Jews, who will have Psal. xcii. whose title is, a *Psalm*, or *song*, *for the sabbath-day*, to have been composed by Adam. For thus the Chaldee paraphrases; "A hymn and song, which the first man said of the sabbath." And R. Levi,* "The first man spoke this psalm, and from his time it was buried in oblivion, but Moses came and renewed it." Now I bring these testimonies to shew, that they speak too confidently, who assert, that it is running counter to the unanimous opinion of the Jews, for any to insist, that the precept of the sabbath was enjoined on the first man. Whoever wants more to this purpose, may consult *Selden de jure naturæ*, &c. *lib.* iii. *c.* 13.

V. These things being supposed, we are further to inquire, in what *the nature of the first sabbath* did consist. Here, again, the learned run into very different opinions. I now take it to be my province, to lay down such propositions, to which, it is to be hoped, that the orthodox, who are lovers of truth, will without difficulty give their assent.

VI. We are to distinguish, first, between *the rest of God*, and *the rest of man*, which God enjoined to him,

* In Bereschit Rabba, sect. 22. at the end.

and recommended by his own example: in which manner also Paul distinguishes, *He also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.**

VII. The *rest* of God consisted, not only in his *ceasing* from the work of any new creation, but also in *that sweet satisfaction* and *delight* he had in the demonstration of his own attributes and perfections, which were gloriously displayed in the work he had now finished, after he had added a lustre to this inferior world, by bestowing upon it a most excellent inhabitant, who was to be a careful spectator, and the herald and proclaimer of the perfections of his Creator, and in whom God himself beheld OU MIKRON TES DOXES AUTOU APAUGASMA, *no small effulgence of his own glory.* Wherefore it is said,† *And on the seventh day he rested, and was refreshed;* not as if he was fatigued, but as rejoicing in his work so happily completed, and in which he beheld what was worthy of his labour.

VIII. God having rested on the seventh day, *sanctified* it, as well by *example*, as by *precept*. By *example*, in as much as he brought man, whom he had newly formed, to the contemplation of his works, and revealed to him both himself and his perfections, that he might love, thank, praise, and glorify him. And indeed, because God rested on the seventh day from all other works, and was only intent upon this, we may conclude, that he sanctified it in an extraordinary manner. He likewise sanctified it by *precept*, enjoining man to employ it in glorifying his Creator. "To sanctify," (as Martyr, whom several commend, says well) "is to set apart something for the worship of God, as it is also taken here." And it was very justly observed by Calvin, "that it was the will of God, that his own exam-

* Heb. iv. 10. † Exod. xxxi. 17.

ple ſhould be a perpetual rule to us." Rabbenu Niſſim, quoted by Abarbanel,* is of the ſame opinion: "And this is the ſanctification of the Sabbath, that, on that day, the ſoul of man be employed on nothing profane, but wholly on things ſacred."

IX. God's *bleſſing* the ſeventh day, may be alſo taken in a twofold ſenſe: *Firſt*, for *his declaring* it to be *bleſſed* and happy, as that in which he had peculiar pleaſure and joy, obſerving all his works in ſuch order, as to be not only to himſelf, but to angels as well as men, a moſt beautiful ſcene, diſplaying the glory of his perfections. That is what David ſays,† *The glory of the Lord ſhall endure for ever, the Lord ſhall rejoice in his works.* Thus God himſelf rejoiced on that day, and conſequently bleſſed it. For as to *curſe a day*, is to abhor and deteſt it, as unfortunate and unhappy, as afflictive and miſerable;‡ ſo, by the rule of contraries, *to bleſs a day*, is to rejoice in it, as delightful and proſperous. And indeed, what day more joyful and more happy than that which ſaw the works of God perfected, and yet not ſtained by any ſin either of angels, or, as is probable, of men? There has been none like it ſince that time, certainly not ſince the entrance of ſin. *Secondly*, It was alſo a part of the *bleſſing* of this day, that God adjudged to man, religiouſly imitating the pattern of his own reſt, the moſt ample bleſſings, and indeed, in that very reſt, the earneſt of a moſt happy reſt in heaven; of which more fully preſently. Elegantly ſaid the ancient Hebrew doctors; "That the bleſſing and ſanctifying of the ſabbath redound to the obſervers thereof, that they may be bleſſed and holy themſelves."

X. The *reſt*, here *enjoined* and recommended to man, comprizes chiefly theſe things: *in general*, that he ſhould

* On the explication of the law, fol. 21. col. 3. † Pſal. civ. 13.
‡ Job ii. 14. Jer. xx. 14.

abſtain from every ſin, thro' the whole courſe of his life, as giving nothing but uneaſineſs, both to himſelf and his God. As the Lord complains,* *Thou haſt been weary of me, O Iſrael;* and,† *thou haſt wearied me with thine iniquities.* By ſinning, we dreadfully tranſgreſs againſt the reſt of God, who cannot delight in a ſinner; of whom and his work he ſays,‡ *They are a burthen to me, I am weary to bear them.* But *more eſpecially*, it is likewiſe man's duty, that as he is the concluding part of the works of God, and the laſt of all the creatures that came out of the hands of his Creator, not ſo to haraſs and fatigue himſelf about the creatures, as to ſeek his happineſs and good in them; but rather, by a holy elevation of mind, aſcend to the Creator himſelf, and acquieſce in nothing ſhort of the enjoyment of his unbounded goodneſs, of the imitation of the pureſt holineſs, and of the expectation of the fulleſt reſt and intimate union with his God. This indeed is the true and ſpiritual reſt, always to be meditated upon, ſought after, and obſerved by man.

XI. Moreover, as man, even in the ſtate of innocence, was to perform ſolemn acts of piety, together with his conſort and children, to whom he was to be their mouth in prayer, thankſgiving, and praiſes; it was neceſſary, that, at that time, laying aſide all other occupations, and all cares about what related to the ſupport of natural life, and ordering thoſe about him to reſt, he might, without any hindrance from the body, religiouſly apply himſelf to this one thing. This, I hope, none of my brethren will refuſe. At leaſt the celebrated Cocceius readily allows it. Whoſe words are theſe.§ "It is right in itſelf, and a part of the image of God, that

* Iſ. xliii. 22. † Ver. 24. ‡ Iſ. i. 14. § Sum. theol. c. xxi. § 10.

man ſhould, as often as poſſible, employ himſelf in the worſhip of God (that is laying aſide the things pertaining to the body and its conveniencies, be wholly taken up in thoſe duties which become a ſoul delighting in God, glorifying him, and celebrating his praiſe;) and that he ſhould do ſo too in the public aſſembly, for the common joy and edification of all."

XII. After man had ſinned, the remembrance of God's reſting, and ſanctifying the ſeventh day, ought to rouſe him from his ſlowneſs and dullneſs, in the worſhip of God, in order to ſpend every ſeventh day therein, laying aſide, for a while, all other employments. But it will be better to explain this in Calvin's words: "God therefore firſt reſted, and then he bleſſed that reſt, that it might be ever afterwards holy among men; or he ſet apart each ſeventh day for reſt, that his own example might be a ſtanding rule." Martyr ſpeaks to the ſame purpoſe: "Hence men are put in mind, that if the church enjoins them to ſet apart a certain day in the week for the worſhip of God, this is not altogether a human device, nor belongs only to the law of Moſes, but likewiſe had its riſe from hence, and is an imitation of God." All this is alſo approved of by Cocceius, whoſe excellent words we will ſubjoin from the place juſt quoted, § 12. "The conſequence of theſe things in the ſinner is—that, if encompaſſed with the infirmities of the fleſh, and expoſed to the troubles of life, he may at leaſt each ſeventh day recollect himſelf, and give himſelf up to far preferable thoughts, and then cheerfully, on account of that part of the worſhip of God, that cannot be performed without diſengaging from buſineſs, abſtain from the work of his hands, and from ſeeking, preparing, and gathering the fruits of the earth." And as this celebrated expoſitor approves of this, I know not, why he ſhould diſapprove the elegant obſer-

vation of Chryſoſtom ;* That "hence, as by certain preludes, God hath enigmatically taught us to conſecrate, and ſet apart for ſpiritual employment, each ſeventh day in the week." If we all agree, as I hope we may, in theſe poſitions, which ſeem not unhappily to explain the nature of the firſt ſabbath; I truly reckon, that a great deal is done, and a way paved to compoſe thoſe unhappy diſputes about the ſabbath of the decalogue, which, for ſome years paſt, have made ſuch noiſe in the Belgic univerſities and churches.

XIII. Having thus explained *the nature* of the firſt ſabbath, we proceed to inquire into its ſpiritual and *myſtical ſignification ;* from whence it will be eaſy to conclude, that we have not improperly called it *a ſacrament ;* or, which is the ſame, a ſacred ſign or ſeal (for why ſhould we wrangle about a word not ſcriptural, when we agree about the thing ?) of the promiſes of ſalvation made by God to Adam. We have Paul's authority to aſſert, that the ſabbath had ſome myſtical meaning, and reſpected an eternal and happy reſt.† And this is juſtly ſuppoſed by the apoſtle, as a thing well known to the Hebrews, and which is a corner-ſtone or fundamental point with their doctors. It was a common proverb, quoted by Buxtorf,‡ "The ſabbath was not given but to be a type of the life to come." To the ſame purpoſe is that which we have in Zohar :§ "What is the ſabbath-day ? A type of the land of the living, which is the world to come, the world of ſouls, the world of conſolations." Theſe things, indeed, are not improper to be ſaid in general; but you will not readily find any where the analogy between the ſabbath and eternal reſt ſpecially aſſigned. Can it be thought improper, if, diſtinguiſhing between *the reſt of God*, *the reſt of*

* Not. at Heb. iv. § 13. † Heb. iv. 4. 10. ‡ In Florilegio Hebræo. § In Gen. fol. v. chap. v.

man, and the *seventh day*, on which both rested, we should distinctly propose the mystical meaning of each?

XIV. *The rest of God* from the work of *the creation*, was a type of a far more glorious rest of God from the work of *the glorification* of the whole universe. When God had created the first world, so as to be a commodious habitation for man, during his probation, and an illustrious theatre of the perfections of the Creator; he took pleasure in this his work, and rested with delight. For he had bestowed upon it all the perfections which were requisite to complete that state. But he had resolved, one day, to produce a far more perfect universe, and, by dissolving the elements by fire, to raise a new heaven and a new earth, as it were, out of the ashes of the old: which new world, being blessed with the immutability of its happiness, was to be a far more magnificent habitation for his glorified creatures, and in which, as in the last display of his perfections, he was for ever to rest with the greatest complacency. And besides, as God, according to his infinite wisdom, so very wisely connects all his actions, that the preceding have a certain respect to the following; in like manner, since that rest of God after the creation was less complete than that other, when God shall have concluded the whole, and which is to be followed by no other labour or toil; it is proper to consider that first rest of God, as a type, and a kind of prelude of that other, which is more perfect. In fine, because it tends to man's greatest happiness, that the whole universe be thus glorified, and himself in the universe, that God may altogether rest in him, as having now obtained his last degree of perfection, he is said *to enter into the rest of God*.*

* Heb. iv. 10.

XV. This *reſt of God* was, after the creation, immediately ſucceeded by *the reſt of man*. For when he had formed man on the ſixth day, without paradiſe (as poſſibly may be gathered from the ſimplicity of Moſes's narrative) he brought him into paradiſe on the ſeventh, JEHOVAH ELOHIM ÆTH HAADAM VAJANNICHEHU BEGAN NGEDÆN, *and put him*, or, as others think the words may be tranſlated, *he made him reſt in the garden of Eden.** Was not this a moſt delightful ſymbol, or ſign, to Adam, that, after having finiſhed his courſe of labour on this earth, he ſhould be tranſlated from the earth, into a place far more pleaſant than paradiſe, and to a reſt far more delighful than that which he enjoyed therein? And when, at certain times, ceaſing from tilling the ground in paradiſe, he gave himſelf wholly up to the religious worſhip of God, with a ſoul delighting in God; was not this a certain earneſt and a prelibation to him of that time, in which, exempted from all care about this animal life, he ſhould immediately delight himſelf in the intimate communion of God, being joined with the choirs of angels, and doing the work of angels?

XVI. May not this reſt both of God and man, falling upon *the ſeventh day*, after the ſix working ones, properly denote, that the *reſt* of the glory of God is then to be expected, after the week of this world is elapſed? and that man is not to enter into reſt, till he has finiſhed his courſe of probation, and God, upon ſtrictly examining it by the rule of his law, finds it complete, and in every reſpect perfect? And are we to reject the learned obſervation of Peter Martyr; that "this ſeventh day is ſaid to have neither morning nor evening, becauſe this is a perpetual reſt to thoſe who are truly the ſons of God?"

* Gen. ii. 15.

XVII. It is indeed true, that, upon Adam's fin, and violation of the covenant of works, the whole face of things was changed: but all theſe things [we have been ſpeaking of] were ſuch, as might have been ſignified and ſealed by this ſabbath to Adam, even in the ſtate of innocence; and why might it not really have been ſo? For the apoſtle expreſsly declares, that *God's reſting from his works, from the foundation of the world*,* had a myſtical ſignification. This being ſuppoſed, it is our buſineſs to find out the agreement between the ſign and the thing ſignified; for the greater analogy we obſerve between them, we ſhall the more clearly and with joy diſcover the infinite wiſdom and goodneſs of God, various ways manifeſting themſelves. It cannot but tend to the praiſe of the divine Architect, if we can obſerve many excellent reſemblances between the picture given us by himſelf, and the copy. Indeed, I deny not, that Paul, when diſcourſing of the ſabbath, leads us to that reſt, which is purchaſed for believers by the ſufferings of Chriſt. But it cannot thence be inferred, that, after the entrance of ſin, God's ſabbath borrowed all its myſtical ſignification from the covenant of grace. For, as to the ſubſtance of the thing, the glorious reſt promiſed by the covenant of works, and now to be obtained by the covenant of grace, is one and the ſame, conſiſting in a bleſſed acquieſcence or reſt of the ſoul in God. As this was ſealed to man in innocence by the ſabbath, under the covenant of works; ſo likewiſe it is ſealed by the ſabbath under the covenant of grace, though under another relation, and under other circumſtances. For God, having perfect knowledge, that man would not continue in the firſt covenant, had, from all eternity, decreed to ſet on foot a quite different order of things,

* Heb. iv. 3.

and bring his elect, by a new covenant of grace, to the most peaceful rest. Accordingly, he settled, in his unsearchable wisdom, whatever preceded the fall, in such a manner, that man, viewing them after the fall with the enlightened eyes of faith, might discover still greater mysteries in them, which regarded Christ, and the glory to be obtained by him. But we are not to speak of these things here. Whoever desires a learned explication of those mysteries, may consult Mestresat's sermons, on the fourth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews.

XVIII. This sabbath also put man in mind of various duties to be performed by him, which having pointed out above, § 10, 11. I think needless to repeat now. And thus we have executed what we promised concerning the sacraments of the covenant of works.

XIX. Here now I might conclude, did not a very learned man come in my way; whose thoughts on the first sabbath, being widely different from the commonly-received notions, I intend, with his permission, calmly to examine. He therefore maintains, that Adam, on the very day of his creation, being seduced by the devil had involved himself and the whole world in the most wretched bondage of corruption: but that God, on the seventh day, restored all things, thus corrupted by the devil and by man, by his gracious promise of the Messiah: upon this restoration he rested in that very day: and that rest, upon the reparation of the world, being peculiar to the seventh day, may be the foundation of the sabbath. Doubtless, *on the sixth day the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them.** And God beholding the works of his creation so perfect, pleasantly rested in them. This was the rest of the sixth day. But on the same day Satan corrupted all: for up-

* Gen. ii. 1.

on losing heaven, of whose host he was one, and which he greatly diminished, by associating many other angels to himself, and so far rendered that habitation a desert; and on earth, by means of a calumnious lie, he rendered man, the prince of the terrestrial host, a subject to himself, a rebel to God, and destitute of life. This was the corruption of the earth. And thus heaven and earth so beautifully finished by God on the sixth day, were on the same basely defiled by Satan and by man. This occasioned God, to be engaged in a new work on the seventh day, even to restore what had been thus defiled and corrupted, and to complete them anew. Which he did on the seventh day, when the Mediator, God-man, was revealed by the gospel, whom, in the promise, he appointed to triumph over Satan the corrupter of all, and so to restore all things; both of the earth, where he began the restoration, by delivering the elect of mankind from the bondage of corruption; and of heaven, by bringing the same chosen people into the heavenly habitation, in order to its being again re-peopled with that colony of new inhabitants: In this manner he will complete the restoration. Which completion Moses intimates,* *And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made. This finishing of the restoration*, signified† by the word LANGASOTH, *made*, is very distinct from *the finishing of the creation*, mentioned ver. 1. When God had done all this, upon giving his Son to men for a Mediator and Redeemer, he himself rested in this, his last work, as this is *the man of his delight.*‡ And this rest was the only foundation for instituting the sabbath. This *institution* consists of a two-fold act: the first is of *blessing*, by which God blessed that very day, by a most distinguishing privilege, to be the day devoted

* Gen. ii. 2. † Ver. 3. ‡ Is. xlii. 1.

to the Meſſiah, who was revealed in it by the goſpel. For this is the honor of the ſabbath, that it is *the delight, on account of the holy of the Lord being glorified.** The other act is that of *ſanctification*, by which he ſet it apart for a ſign and memorial of that benefit, becauſe, through and for *the holy of the Lord being glorified*, he chuſes to ſanctify the elect. This is the ſum of that opinion. Let us now conſider, whether it be ſolid, and can be proved by ſcripture.

XX. The whole foundation of this opinion is, that Adam fell on the very day in which he was created: which the ſcripture no where ſays. I know there are ſome of the Jewiſh doctors, who with boldneſs, as is their way, aſſert this; and, as if they were perfectly acquainted with what God was about every hour, declare, that man was created the third hour of the day, fell the eleventh, and was expelled paradiſe the twelfth. But this raſhneſs is to be treated with indignation. The learned perſon deems it his glory to be wiſe from the ſcriptures alone, and juſtly: for thus it becomes a divine. But what ſcripture determines any thing about the day of the firſt ſin? We have here ſcarce any more than bare conjectures, which at beſt are but a very ſandy foundation, on which it does not appear to be the part of a wiſe architect to build ſo grand an edifice.

XXI. Nay, there are many things, which rather incline us to think, that man's ſin happened not on the ſixth day. For after God had, on that day, created the beaſts; after he had formed Adam of the duſt of the earth; after he had preſcribed him the law concerning the tree of knowledge of good and evil; after he had preſented to him the beaſts in paradiſe, that, upon in-

* Iſ. lviii. 13.

quiring into the nature of each (which alſo he performed with great accuracy, as the great Bochart has very learnedly ſhewn*) he might call each by their proper names; after Adam had found, that there was not among them any help-meet for him, for the purpoſes and convenience of marriage; and after God had caſt Adam into a deep ſleep, then at laſt Eve was formed from Adam's rib. All theſe things are not of a nature to be performed, like the other works of the preceding days, in the ſhorteſt ſpace of time poſſible, and, as it were, in a moment; but they ſucceeded one another in diſtinct periods, and, during theſe, ſeveral things muſt have been done by Adam himſelf. Nay, there are divines of no ſmall note, who inſiſt, that all theſe things were not done in one day; and others poſtpone the creation of Eve to one of the days of the following week. But we do not now engage in theſe diſputes. After all theſe things, the world was yet innocent, and free from all guilt, at leaſt on the part of man. And God, contemplating his works, and concluding his day, approved of all as very good and beautiful. He had yet no new labour for reſtoring the fallen world, which would have been nowiſe inferior to the work of the creation. But what probability is there, that, in thoſe very few hours which remained, if yet a ſingle hour remained, Adam ſhould have parted from Eve, who had been juſt created, expoſed moſt his beloved conſort to an inſidious ſerpent, and that both of them, juſt from the hands of the Creator, ſhould ſo ſuddenly have given ear to the deceiver? Unleſs one is prepoſſeſſed in favor of the contrary opinion, what reaſon could he have, notwithſtanding ſo many probabilities to the contrary, prematurely thus to hurry on Adam's ſin? Since therefore the whole of this foun-

* Hierozoic. lib. i. c. 9.

dation is so very weak, what solid superstructure can we imagine it is capable of?

XXII. Let us now take a nearer view of the superstructure itself, and examine, whether its construction be sufficiently firm and compact. The very learned person imagines he sees a new *labour* on the seventh day, and a new *rest* succeeding that labour, which is the foundation of the sabbath. The *labour* was *a promise of the Messiah*, by which the world, miserably polluted with sin, was to be restored. Of this labour Moses treats, *And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made.** The *rest* was the satisfaction and delight he had in that promise, and in the Messiah promised. But let us oppose the following considerations to this sentiment. 1. If God, on the seventh day, performed the immense work of recovering the world from the fall; a work, which if not greater, yet certainly is not less than the creation of the world out of nothing, and he was again to rest, when he had finished it; certainly then, the seventh day was as much a day of work to God, and no more a sabbath, or day of rest, than any of the preceding days. For God having finished the work of each day, rested for a while, and delighted in it. 2. Moses, in the second verse, makes use of the same word, by which he had expressed the finishing of the world in the first. But *the finishing* in the first verse, as the learned person himself owns, relates to the finishing of the creation; what necessity then can there be for giving such different senses to one and the same word, in the same context, when there is not the least mark of distinction? 3. Hitherto Moses has not given the least imaginable hint of the fall of our first parents: is it then probable, that he would so abruptly mention the restitution of the world

* Hierozoic. chap. ii. 2.

from the fall; and that in the very same words, which he had just used, and was afterwards to use for explaining the first creation? What can oblige, or who can suffer us to confound the neatness of Moses's method, and the perspicuity of his words, by this feigned irregularity and ambiguity? 4. It may be doubted, whether we can properly say, that, by the promise of the Messiah, all things were perfected and finished; since God, if we follow the thread of Moses's narrative, did, after this promise, punish the world with a deserved curse; and the apostle still says of the world, that *the creature was made subject to vanity, and groans under the bondage of corruption.** It is indeed true, that the promise of the Messiah, which could not be frustrated, was the foundation of the comfort of the fathers; but the scripture no where declares, that, by this promise, as immediately made after the fall, all things were finished: nay, even this promise pointed out that person, who, after many ages, and by various acts, not of one and the same office, was to effect the true consummation.

XXIII. Our learned author urges the following reasons, why those two finishings are not to be looked upon as the same. 1. It would be a *tautology*, if not an *inexcusable battology*, or idle repetition, in such a compendious narrative; and either the first verse, or the beginning of the second, would be superfluous. 2. The finishing or ending, ver. 2. is annexed to *the seventh day*, by a double article, in the same manner as *the rest* is. *And on the very seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the very seventh day from all his work which he had made.* So that, if the former verb VAJCAL be rendered by the preterpluperfect, *and he had ended*, the latter VAJISHEBOTH must be render-

* Rom. vii. 20, 21.

ed so too, *and he had rested;* but this is incongruous. Nay, since on the other days we reject the preterpluperfect sense, lest the works of the following day should be referred to those of the preceding; contrary to historical truth; it ought not then here to be admitted on the seventh day. 3. When the third verse shews the cause of this rest, it speaks of distinct finishings, the latter of which is that of the seventh day, *And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God* BARA *created and made.* By two verbs he describes two actions; BARA denotes *to create*, and NGASAH, to *adorn*, to *polish.* These words are frequently of the same import, yet, when joined together, they are to be distinguished; as is owned not only by Christian, but by Jewish interpreters. (Thus it is, Is. xliii. 7, where another word is added, JETZAR, to *form;* and as to all the three, BARA certainly signifies, *the creation of the soul*, but JATZAR, *the formation of the body*, and NGASAH, *reformation by grace.)* But these two actions are so described, that MANGASÆH, *making*, immediately precedes *resting*, and was the work of the seventh day; but BERIAH, *creation*, the work of the six preceding days. 4. To the same purpose is the recapitulation of ver. 4. which repeats and confirms the distinction just now mentioned: *These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were created; in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.* Thus he recites the generations both of the first six days, in which the heavens and the earth, with their respective hosts, were created, and of the beginning of that one day, namely, the seventh, which is that of operation, in which he made and polished, inverting the order; first the earth, then the heavens. Thus far our very learned author.

XXIV. But we cannot assent to these things, and therefore we answer each in order. To *the first*, I would earnestly entreat our brother, both to think and speak more reverently of the style of the Holy Ghost, nor charge those simple and artless repetitions of one and the same thing, even in a concise narrative, with an inexcusable tautoligy, if not a battology, or vain and useless repetition. It does not become us, the humble disciples of the divine Spirit, to criticise on the most learned language, and the most pure style of our adorable Master. It is very frequent, in the sacred writings, more than once to repeat the same thing, in almost the same words, at no great distance asunder. This very second chapter of Genesis, of which we now treat, gives us various examples of this. The reason of the sanctification of the seventh day, namely, the rest of God upon that day, is proposed in nearly the same words, in the second and third verses. This learned person himself calls the fourth verse a recapitulation of what was just said. And what is the whole of the second chapter, but a fuller explication of the formation of man, which indeed we have plainly, but more briefly, related in the first chapter? Shall we therefore say, that a part of the first chapter, or the whole of the second, is in a great measure superfluous? Or shall we dare to charge God with tautologies, if not with inexcusable battologies? Is it not more becoming to tremble with awe at his words, and rather return him thanks, that, on account of the dulness of our apprehension, he has vouchsafed to propose, two or three times, the same truths, either in the same or in a variety of words, having all the same meaning? For my own part, I would act in this manner, without any doubt of acting as becomes.

XXV. To *the second* I would answer: 1. The words of Moses may be taken in this sense, namely, that God

finiſhed the work of the ſixth day, and conſequently of all the ſix days, in the very moment in which the ſeventh began. Thus the ancient Hebrews, and after them, Rabbi Salomo, explain this manner of ſpeaking; as thereby to intimate, that God, in the very moment in which he entered on the ſabbath, finiſhed his work: for God alone knows the moments and leaſt parts of time in another manner than men do. 2. Nor is it an improper obſervation of Aben Ezra, "that the finiſhing of the work is not the work itſelf," but only means the ceaſing from work, and that the text explains itſelf thus; *And he finiſhed*, that is, *and he reſted;* having finiſhed his work, he worked no longer. 3. But we need not inſiſt on this. Druſius ſpeaks to excellent purpoſe on this place: "The preterperfect Hebrew may be as well rendered by the preterpluperfect as otherwiſe. It is really ſo: the Hebrews have only one preterperfect, which they uſe for every kind of paſt time: and therefore, according to the connection, it may be rendered ſometimes by the preterperfect, and at other times by the preterpluperfect." Let it therefore be rendered here by the preterpluperfect, *And he had finiſhed*, as the Dutch tranſlation has alſo done, and all the difficulty will diſappear. Our learned author may inſiſt, that if this be granted, then the following VAJISHEBOTH muſt be alſo rendered by the preterpluperfect. But it does not follow: for we are to conſider the nature of the ſubject and the different circumſtances. The learned perſon inſiſts, that the word *finiſhing* is uſed in a different ſenſe in the firſt, from what it is in the ſecond verſe; and ſhall we not be allowed to interpret a preterperfect, which, by the genius of the language, is indeterminate, ſometimes by the preterperfect, and at other times by the preterpluperfect, as the ſubject ſhall require? And if elſewhere we juſtly reject the preterpluperfect ſenſe, it is

not becauſe the genius of the Hebrew tongue does not admit of it, but becauſe, as the learned perſon himſelf obſerves, ſuch an interpretation is contrary to the truth of the hiſtory. Which not being the caſe here, ſuch a reaſon cannot be urged. I will only add, if Moſes wanted to ſay, what we imagined he has ſaid, *et conſummaverat Deus die ſeptimo*, &c. *et ceſſavit*, &c. and *on the ſeventh day God had finiſhed*, &c. *and reſted*, &c. could he poſſibly have expreſſed in other words, or more aptly, according to the genius of the language, this ſenſe? Was the learned perſon himſelf to render into Hebrew, word for word, theſe Latin words, he would certainly have rendered them in the ſame tenſe and mood, as Moſes has done.

XXVI. To *the third* reaſon, I reply: 1. The word NGASAH is very general, and ſignifies, *to do a thing any how*, *well* or *ill*. It is ſaid, of penal or phyſical evil, Amos iv. 13. NGOSEH SHACHAR NGEPHAH, *Who maketh the morning darkneſs;* and Ezek. xxxv. 6. LEDAM ÆNGÆSCHA, *I will prepare (make) thee unto blood*. And of moral evil, Mic. ii. 1. *When the morning is light, they practiſe it;* JANGASUHA. We ſhall give more inſtances preſently. Hence it appears, that the learned perſon too much reſtricts the meaning of this word, when he explains it by the words, *to adorn* or *poliſh;* eſpecially, if he would preciſely confine it to *the reformation by grace*. 2. The ſame word NGASAH is often expreſſive of the ſix days work; as Gen. i. 31. *And God ſaw* ÆTH CÂL ASHÆR NGASAH, *all that he had made;* and Exod. xx. 11. *In ſix days the Lord* NGASAH *made heaven and earth:* likewiſe Ezek. xlvi. 1. SHESHÆTH JEMEI HAMMANGASÆH *the ſix working days* are oppoſed to the ſabbath. Neither does the learned perſon deny, that the words BARA and NGASAH are often equivalent. And why not here alſo? Is there

any neceſſity, or probable reaſon, for taking MANGASÆH for *the work of the ſeventh day*, and BERIAH for *the work of the ſix preceding days?* 3. I think he goes a little too far, when he aſſerts, that both Chriſtian and Jewiſh interpreters admit, that theſe words, when joined together, have diſtinct ſignifications. Truly, for my own part, of the ſeveral interpreters, both Jewiſh and Chriſtians, whom I have conſulted, I never found one, who diſtinguiſhes the meaning of theſe words, as this learned author has done. See Fagius on Gen. i. 1. Menaſſeh ben Iſrael, de creat. probl. 4. Cocceius, diſput. ſelect. p. 70. § 72. Let us, in this caſe, hear the very learned de Dieu, who thus comments on this paſſage. "It appears to be an uſual Hebraiſm, whereby the infinitive, LANGASOTH, added to a verb, including a like action, is generally redundant: ſuch as Judg. xiii. 19. And acting, he acted wonderouſly, that is, *he acted wonderouſly*. 1 Kings xiv. 9. And doing, thou haſt done evil, that is, *Thou haſt done evil*. 2 Kings xxi. 6. And working, he multiplied wickedneſs, that is ſimply, *he multiplied wickedneſs*, or, *he wrought much wickedneſs*. 2 Chron. xx. 35. He doing, did wickedly; *doing* is redundant. Pſal. cxxvi. 2. The Lord doing, has done great things for them; *doing* is again redundant. Eccl. ii. 11. On the labour that doing, I had laboured, that is ſimply, *I had laboured*. Which laſt paſſage is entirely parallel with this in Geneſis; for whether you ſay, NGAMAL LANGASOTH, he doing, laboured, or BARA LANGASOTH, he making, created, you ſay the ſame thing: unleſs that BARA ſignifies to produce ſomething new, without any precedent or pattern, and which had no exiſtence before; therefore, he making, created, is no other than, *he made ſomething new*." Theſe things neither could, nor ought to be unknown to this learned

perſon, conſidering his great ſkill in Hebrew learning. 4. He ought not to have made ſuch a diſtinction, barely and without any proof, between the words BARA JATZAR and NGASAH, which are uſed by Iſaiah, xliii. 7. as if the firſt intends *the creation* of the ſoul; the ſecond *the formation* of the body; and the third, *the reformation* by grace: there not being the leaſt foundation for it in ſcripture. For, 1. BARA ſometimes ſignifies *reformation by grace*, as Pſal. li. 10, BERA LI *create in me a clean heart.* 2. JATZAR is ſometimes applied to the ſoul, Zech. xii. 1. *and* VEJOTZER RUACH ADAM BEKIRCO, *formeth the ſpirit of man within him*: and Pſal. xxxiii. 15. HAJOTZER JACHAD LIBBAM, *and faſhioneth their hearts alike*; ſometimes too it denotes *formation by grace*; as If. xliii. 21. *This people* JATZARTI *have I formed for myſelf, they ſhall ſhew forth my praiſe.* 3. NGASAH is more than once uſed *for the firſt formation* of man; as Gen. i. 26. NANGASÆH *Let us make man*: and Gen. ii. 18. ÆNGÆSÆH *I will make him an help-meet for him*; Jer. xxxviii. 16. ASHÆR NGASAH *that made us this ſoul*, ſays king Zedekiah to Jeremiah, without having any thoughts of a reformation by grace. Since therefore all theſe words are ſo promiſcuouſly uſed in ſcripture, ought we not to look upon him, who diſtinguiſhes them in ſuch a magiſterial manner, as one who gives too much ſcope to his own fancy? And what if one ſhould invert the order of our author, and poſitively aſſert, that BARA here denotes *reformation by grace*, as Pſal. li. 10. JATZAR *the production of the ſoul*, as Zech. xii. 1. and N'GASAH, *the formation* of the body, as Gen. ii. 8. what reply could the learned perſon make? But theſe are weak arguments. It is more natural to take theſe words in Iſaiah, as meant of the new creation and reformation by grace. And this accumulation or multiplying of words is very proper to denote

the exceeding greatneſs of the power of God, and his effectual working in the ſanctification of the elect. There is a parallel place, Eph. ii. 10. *For we are his.* Heb. MANGASÆH *(workmanſhip)* Heb. NIBRAIM, *created in Chriſt Jeſus unto good works, which God* JATZAR, *hath before ordained, that we ſhould walk in them:* as Iſ. xxii. 11. VEJOTZRAH MERACHOK *faſhioned it long ago*, which properly PROETOIMASE he hath *before ordained.* From all this it appears, that this paſſage in Iſaiah can be of no ſervice to our learned author. 5. But if we muſt diſtinguiſh between TO BARA and TO NGASAH, nothing, I think, is more to the purpoſe than the interpretation of Ben Nachman. "He reſted from all his works, which BARA, he created, by producing ſomething out of nothing, LANGASOTH, to make of it all the works mentioned in the ſix days: and lo! he ſays, he reſted from *creating* and from *working; from creating*, as having created in the firſt day, and *from working*, as having completed his working in the remaining days."

XXVII. The fourth reaſon coincides with the foregoing, only that it is ſtill more cabaliſtical. 1. 'Tis a ſtrange interpretation to ſay, that by TOLEDOTH, *the generations of heaven and earth*, we are to underſtand not only their firſt creation, but their reſtoration by the promiſe of the Meſſiah. For it is quite foreign to the ſubject to tell us, that, by the ſin of the angels, a ſtate of corruption was introduced into the heaven of heavens, and thereby the throne of the divine majeſty was baſely defiled; for though, by the angelical apoſtaſy, corruption had been introduced into heaven, yet by their ejection, whereby they were hurled into hell, the heavens were purged from that corruption. Nor was there any new heaven made by the promiſe of the Meſſiah, that was given on the ſixth day: for that promiſe made no alteration there, but only foretold, that, after many years,

ſome elect ſouls were to be received into that holy and bleſſed habitation. 2. As to the order, in which the earth is put before the heavens; 'tis well known, that the ſcripture does not always relate things in the ſame order. Nor from the mere order of the narrative, which is an arbitrary thing, can any arguments be formed. However, Junius's obſervation is not to be rejected. "Earth and heaven are mentioned in an inverted order, becauſe the formation of the earth preceded that of the heavens: for the earth was perfected on the third day of the creation; heaven on the fourth." 3. 'Tis doing manifeſt violence to the text, if we underſtand the formation of the earth and heavens, of their reformation by grace, in virtue of the promiſe of the Meſſiah, made on the ſeventh day; becauſe Moſes treats of that formation of earth and heaven, which was prior to that of plants and herbs; as appears from the connection of ver. 3. with ver. 4. For thus the words run: *Theſe are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, when they were created; in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens, and every plant of the field, before it was in the earth, and every herb of the field*, &c. Or, as the learned de Dieu ſhews, they may otherwiſe be very properly rendered; *In the day that the Lord made the heavens and the earth, there was yet no plant of the field created*, &c. So that this formation of the earth and the heavens was prior to man's own creation, much more to the fall, and to the reſtitution from the fall. And this verſe wholly overturns the diſtinction which this learned perſon has invented.

XXVIII. And thus we have ſhewn that the words of Moſes neither mention nor intimate any work by which God reſtored all things from the fall on the ſeventh day. Neither is there to be found therein any *reſt* from that work of reſtoration, which is the foundation of the reſt

of the ſabbath. For, 1. It is irrational to ſuppoſe, that when God promiſed the Meſſiah, he then reſted from the work of the gracious reformation of the univerſe; becauſe that promiſe was a prophecy of the ſufferings, conflicts, and at laſt of the death of Chriſt, by which that reformation was to be brought about and accompliſhed. 2. How can it be ſaid, that God reſted, immediately after having made that promiſe, from all his work, when directly upon it he pronounced and executed ſentence upon Adam, Eve, and the earth, that was curſed for their crime, and expelled them paradiſe? Which work (to ſpeak after the manner of men, compare Iſ. xxviii. 21.) was truly a greater labour to God than the very creation of the world. And thus, inſtead of a ſabbath, which Moſes deſcribes, this day is made one of the moſt laborious to God. 3. The ſabbath-day, after the publication of the firſt goſpel-promiſe, was doubtleſs ſacred to the Meſſiah, and to be celebrated to his honor by the ſaints, with a holy exultation of ſoul. Nor ſhall I be much againſt the learned perſon, ſhould he chuſe to tranſlate Iſ. lviii. 13. that the ſabbath may be called *a delight, on account of the holy of the Lord being glorified:* but it cannot, with any probability, be inferred from this, that the promiſe of the Meſſiah was the foundation of the firſt ſabbath; ſince the ſabbath, as well as other things, did not acquire that relation till after the fall. 4. The ſcripture in expreſs terms declares, that the reſt of God from the work of the firſt creation, which was completed in ſix days, was the foundation of the ſabbath. *In ſix days the Lord made heaven and earth, the ſea, and all that in them is, and reſted the ſeventh day: wherefore the Lord bleſſed the ſabbath-day, and hallowed it.** Which being plain, it ſufficiently, if I miſtake not, appears, that it is much ſafer to go in the

* Exod. xx. 11.

old and beaten path, which is the king's highway, than in that other new-trodden and rough one, which the learned perſon, whoſe opinion we have been examining, has choſen to tread in. And ſo much for this ſubject.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Violation of the Covenant of Works on the part of Man.

AS the ſcripture does not declare, how long this covenant, thus ratified and confirmed, continued unbroken, we are ſatisfied to remain in the dark. And we would have a holy dread of preſuming raſhly to fix the limits of a time, which is really uncertain. It is however evident, that man, wickedly preſuming to eat the fruit of the forbidden tree, incurred the guilt of violating the covenant. Nor ought that to be deemed a ſmall ſin (as the apoſtle* calls it *the offence*, *diſobedience* and *tranſgreſſion*) becauſe it may ſeem to have been committed about a thing of no great importance. For the meaner the thing is, from which God commanded to abſtain, and for which man deſpiſed the promiſe of the covenant, makes his tranſgreſſion of it the more heinous; as may be illuſtrated by the profaneneſs of Eſau, which was ſo much the greater, as the meſs was of ſo little value, for which he ſold *his birth-right*.† In that ſin, as divines generally obſerve, there was, as it were, a kind of complication of many crimes. But it is our chief purpoſe, to ſhew, that this was the viola-

* Rom. v. † Heb. xii. 16.

tion of the whole covenant. For not only that tree, as we proved above, was a ſacrament of the covenant, the abuſe of which ought to be looked upon as a violence done to the whole; not only the precept concerning that tree, which was the trial of univerſal obedience; but likewiſe the covenant in its whole conſtitution, was violated by that tranſgreſſion. *The law* of the covenant was trampled upon, when man, as if he had been his own lord and maſter in all things, did, in defiance of his Lord, lay hold on what was not his property, and throw off the yoke of obedience, that was due to God. *The promiſes* of the covenant were ſet leſs by than a tranſitory guſt of pleaſure, and the empty promiſes of the ſeducer. And that dreadful death, which the author of the covenant threatened the tranſgreſſor with, was not conſidered and thought of in all its dreadful effects, but he preſumed to act in oppoſition to it. And thus *Adam tranſgreſſed the covenant.**

II. Though Eve had the firſt hand in this crime, yet it is uſually in ſcripture aſcribed to Adam: *By one man ſin entered into the world*, according to Paul, Rom. v. 12. whom, ver. 14. he declares to be Adam. For Adam was the head of the covenant, with whom, even before the creation of Eve, God ſeems to have tranſacted. Adam was the root of all mankind, and even of Eve herſelf, who was formed out of one of his ribs. Neither is it cuſtomary to deduce a genealogy from a woman. Nor was the covenant judged to be entirely broke, till Adam alſo added his own crime to that of his wife's. Then it was that the Creator, firſt acting in the character of a Judge, ſummoned to his bar the inconſiderate pair, already condemned by their own conſcience. But we are not to think that this inheri-

* Hoſ. vi. 7.

tance of sin was so derived from our father Adam, as to excuse our mother Eve from that guilt. For as by marriage they were made one flesh, so far they may be considered as one man. Nay, Adam is not considered as the head and root of mankind, but in conjunction with his wife. To this purpose is what Malachi* says, that God, *seeking a godly seed, made one ;* one pair ; two into one flesh.

III. He who seduced man to this apostasy, was doubtless a wicked spirit, who, tormented with the horrors of his guilty conscience, envied man his happiness in God, and God the pleasure he had in man, seeking wretched consolation in a partaker of his misery. The more easily to insinuate himself into man's favor, by his insnaring discourse, he concealed himself in the serpent, the most subtle of all animals, and at that time not less acceptable to man, than the rest of the obsequious creatures. The great Du Moulin† conjectures, this serpent was of a conspicuous form, with fiery eyes, decked with gold, and marked with shining spots, and such as to draw the eyes of Eve to it : and that he had, before that time, more than once insinuated himself, by his soothing sounds, into Eve's favor ; in order, that, having preconceived a good opinion of him, she might be brought the more readily to yield to him. In fine, he was such, that what Moses says of the subtilty of the serpent, must be applied to him only, and not to the whole species. To this conjecture it is also added, that Eve perhaps, such was her simplicity, did not know, whether God had bestowed the use of speech on any other animals, besides man. Laurentius Kamires,‡ (quoted by Bochart,§ goes a step farther, and feigns, that Eve was wont to play with the serpent, and adorn

* Hos. ii. 15. † Disput. 3. de angelis, § 44. ‡ In his Pentecontarch. c. 1. § Hierozoic. lib. i. c. 4. p. 30.

her boſom, neck, and arms, with it: and hence, at this day, the ornaments for thoſe parts have the reſemblance of ſerpents, and are called OPEIS, *ſerpents*, by the Greeks.

IV. But all this is apocryphal. We are not ſo far to pleaſe ourſelves, as to advance ſuch romantic things, without ſcripture-authority. Whether this was the firſt, or the only apparition of the ſerpent, as having the uſe of ſpeech, I ſhall neither boldly affirm, nor obſtinately deny. But what things are told, as probable, of ſome extraordinary ſerpent ſo curiouſly ſpotted and ſet off, and now made familiar to Eve, by an intercourſe repeated ſeveral times, are the pleaſing amuſements of a curious mind. The ſubtilty of ſerpents is every where ſo well known, that among many nations they are propoſed as the diſtinguiſhing character and hieroglyphic of prudence. Bochart* has collected many things relating to this, from ſeveral authors. To this purpoſe is what our Saviour ſays, Matth. x. 16. *Be ye wiſe as ſerpents.* 'Tis alſo injurious and reproachful to our mother Eve, to repreſent her ſo weak, and at ſo ſmall a remove from the brutal creation, as not to be able to diſtinguiſh between a brute and a man, and to be ignorant, that the uſe of ſpeech was the peculiar privilege of rational creatures. Such ſtupid ignorance is inconſiſtent with the happy ſtate of our firſt parents, and with the image of God, which ſhone ſo illuſtriouſly alſo in Eve. We are rather to believe, that the devil aſſumed this organ, the more eaſily to recommend himſelf to man, as a prudent ſpirit; eſpecially ſince this looked like a miracle, or a prodigy at leaſt, that the ſerpent ſhould ſpeak with human voice. Here was ſome degree

* In Hierozoic. l. i. c. 4.

of probability, that ſome ſpirit lay concealed in this animal, and that too extraordinarily ſent by God, who ſhould inſtruct man more fully about the will of God, and whoſe words this very miracle, as it were, ſeemed to confirm. For that ſerpents have a tongue unadapted to utter articulate ſounds, is the obſervation of Ariſtotle.* See Voſſius, *de idol. lib.* iv. *c.* 55.

V. As this temptation of the devil is ſomewhat like to all his following ones, we judge it not improbable, that Satan exerted all his cunning, and transformed himſelf, as he uſually does, into an angel of light, to addreſs himſelf to Eve, as an extraordinary teacher of ſome important truth, not yet fully underſtood. Therefore he does not pretend openly to contradict *the command* of God; but, *firſt*, propoſes it as a doubt, whether Adam underſtood well the meaning of the divine prohibition; whether he faithfully related it to Eve; whether ſhe herſelf too did not miſtake the ſenſe of it; and whether at leaſt that command, taken literally, was not ſo improbable, as to render it neceſſary to think of a more myſterious meaning. And thus he teaches to raiſe *reaſonings and murmurings* againſt the words of God, which are the deſtruction of faith.

VI. Next, he undermines the threatening annexed to the command, *Ye ſhall not ſurely die*, ſays he: God never meant by death, what you in your ſimplicity are apt to ſuſpect. Could death be ſuppoſed to hang on ſo pleaſant and agreeable a tree? Or do you imagine God ſo envious, as to forbid you, who are his familiars and friends, to eat the fruit of ſo delicious a tree, under the penalty of a dreadful death? This is inconſiſtent with his infinite goodneſs, which you ſo largely experience, and with the beauty of this ſpecious tree, and the come-

* De part. anim. lib. ii. c. 17.

lineſs of its fruit. There muſt therefore be another meaning of this expreſſion, which you do not underſtand. And thus he inſtilled that hereſy into the unwary woman, the firſt heard of in the world, that there is a ſin which does not deſerve death, or, which is the ſame thing, that there is *a venial ſin*. The falſe prophet, the attendant on Antichriſt, *who hath horns like a lamb, and ſpeaketh as a dragon*, Rev. xiii. 11. does, at this very day, maintain this capital hereſy in the church of Rome; and nothing is ſtill more uſual with Satan, than, by hope of impunity, to perſuade men to ſin.

VII. He adds the promiſe of a greater happineſs: *Your eyes ſhall be opened, and ye ſhall be as gods, knowing good and evil.* He preſuppoſes, what in itſelf was true and harmleſs, that man had a deſire after ſome more perfect happineſs; which he made to conſiſt in his being made like to God; which John affirms to be, as it were, the principal mark of ſalvation, that *we ſhall be like God*, 1 John iii. 2. He ſays further, that this likeneſs was to be joined with the opening of their eyes, and a greater meaſure of knowledge. Nor is this unlike the doctrines of the ſcripture, which affirm, that we *ſhall ſee God*, and that, *as he is*; and *ſhall know him, even as we ourſelves are known*. And thus far indeed it might appear, that Satan ſpoke not amiſs, blending many truths, and thoſe approving themſelves to the conſcience, with his own lies, the more eaſily to deceive under the appearance of a true teacher. But herein the fraud lies concealed: 1. That he teaches them, not to wait for God's appointed time, but by an unadviſed precipitancy lay hold on the promiſed felicity. Man cannot indeed too much love and deſire perfection, if he does it by *preparation* and *earneſt expectation*; preparing himſelf in holy patience, and ſubjection to his will of the will of God, deſiring not to anticipate, even for a moment, the good pleaſure

of God. 2. That he points out a falſe way, as if the eating of that tree was either a natural, or, more probably, a moral mean, to attain the promiſed bliſs; and as if God had appointed this as a neceſſary requiſite, without which there was no poſſibility of coming to a more intimate communion with God, and a more perfect degree of wiſdom; nor, in fine, of obtaining that ſtate, in which, knowing equally good and evil, they would be no longer in danger of any degree of deception. And it is moſt likely, that to this purpoſe he perverted the meaning of the name of the tree. But all theſe were mere deluſions.

VIII. At laſt this diſguiſed teacher appeals to the knowledge of God himſelf: *God doth know.* Moſt interpreters, both Jewiſh and Chriſtian, ancient and modern, interpret theſe words, as if Satan would charge God with open malignity and envy, in forbidding this tree, leſt he ſhould be obliged to admit man into a partnerſhip in his glory. And indeed there is no blaſphemy ſo horrid, that Satan is aſhamed of. But we are here to conſider, whether ſuch a ſhocking blaſphemy, ſo crudely propoſed, ſhould not have rather ſtruck horror into man, who had not yet entertained any bad thoughts of God, than recommended itſelf by any appearance of probability. For why? Is it credible, that a man not deprived of his ſenſes could be perſuaded, that the acquiſition of wiſdom and a likeneſs to God depended on a tree; ſo that he ſhould obtain both theſe by eating of it, whether God would or not? And then, that God, whom man muſt know to be infinitely great and good, was liable to the paſſion of envy; a plain indication of malignity and weakneſs: in fine, that there was ſuch a virtue in that tree, that on taſting it, God could not deprive man of life. For all theſe particulars were to be believed by him, who can imagine, that, out of envy,

God had forbid him the uſe of that tree. It does not ſeem to be conſiſtent with the ſubtilty of Satan, to judge it adviſeable to propoſe to man things ſo abſurd, and ſo repugnant to common notions, and the innate knowledge, which he muſt have had of God. Is it not more proper, to take that expreſſion for a form of an oath? As Paul himſelf ſays, 2 Cor. xi. 11. *God knoweth*, ſo as the perjured impoſtor appealed to God, as witneſs of what he advanced.

IX. There are who think that Adam was not deceived, namely, to believe as true what the ſerpent had perſuaded the woman to; but rather fell out of love to his wife, whoſe mind he was unwilling to grieve: and therefore, though he was conſcious of a divine command, and not expoſed to the wiles of Satan; yet, that he might not abandon her in this condition, taſted the fruit ſhe offered; probably believing, that this inſtance of his affection for the ſpouſe, whom God had given him, if in any meaſure faulty, might be eaſily excuſed. To this they refer the apoſtle's words, 1 Tim. ii. 14. *For Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the tranſgreſſion.* But this carries us off from the ſimplicity of the divine oracles. The deſign of the apoſtle is plainly to ſhew that the woman ought not to exerciſe any dominion over her huſband, for two reaſons, which he urges. 1. Becauſe Adam was firſt created, as the head; and then Eve, as a help-meet for him. 2. Becauſe the woman ſhewed, ſhe was more eaſily deceived; as who, being deceived firſt, was the cauſe of deceiving her huſband: who was likewiſe deceived like her, though not firſt, but by her means. For nothing is more frequent in the ſacred writings, than that a thing may ſeem to be *abſolutely* denied, which ought to be underſtood only, as denied in a reſtrictive ſenſe. John vi. 27. and Phil. ii. 4, are inſtances of

this. Nor can it be conceived, how Adam, believing, that what he did was forbidden by God, and that, if he did it, he ſhould forfeit the promiſed happineſs, nay, incur moſt certain death (for all this he muſt know and believe, if he ſtill remained uncorrupted by the wiles of Satan) would have made himſelf a partner in the crime, only to pleaſe his wife. Certainly, if he believed, that the tranſgreſſion of the divine command, the contempt of the promiſed felicity, and his raſh expoſing of himſelf to the danger of eternal death, could be excuſed only by his affection for his wife, he no leſs ſhamefully erred, nor was leſs deceived, if not more, than his conſort herſelf. Nor can it be concluded, from his anſwer to God, in which he throws the blame, not on the ſerpent's deceit, but on the woman, whom God had given him, that the man fell into this ſin, not ſo much by an error in the underſtanding, as giving way to his affection. For this ſubverts the whole order of the faculties of the ſoul; ſince every error in the affection ſuppoſes ſome error in the underſtanding. This was doubtleſs an error, and indeed one of the greateſt, to believe, that a higher regard was to be paid to his affection for his wife, than to the divine command. It was a conſiderable error, to think, that it was an inſtance of love, to become an accomplice in ſin: becauſe it is the duty of love, to convince the ſinner, and, as far as may be, reſtore him to the favor of God; which certainly Adam would have done, had he been entirely without error. In whatever light therefore you view this point, you muſt be obliged to own, that he was deceived. This only Adam, by his apology, ſeems to have intended, that his beloved conſort had, by her inſinuations, which ſhe had learned from the ſerpent, perſuaded him alſo; and that he was not the firſt in that ſin, nor readily ſuſpected any error or deception by her, who was given him as an help by God.

X. It cannot be doubted, but that providence was concerned about this fall of our firſt parents. It is certain, that it was foreknown from eternity: which none can deny, but he who by a ſacrilegious audacity goes about to rob God of his omniſcience. Nay, as God, by his eternal decree, laid the plan of the whole œconomy of our ſalvation, and the preconceived ſucceſſion of the moſt important things preſuppoſes the ſin of man, it could not therefore happen unforeſeen by God. And this is the more evident, becauſe, according to Peter, *Chriſt was forordained before the foundation of the world*, and that as the lamb, whoſe blood was to be ſhed.* Which invincible argument Socinus knew not how to elude, otherwiſe than by this ridiculous aſſertion, "That after men had ſinned, Chriſt indeed came to aboliſh their ſins; but that he would have come notwithſtanding, tho' they had never ſinned." But this idle aſſertion, beſides being unſcriptural, nay antiſcriptural, is not appoſite to this place. For the order of Peter's words does not admit any other interpretation than of Chriſt's being foreknown, as a lamb to be ſlain, and to ſhed his blood, to be the price of our redemption. And he likewiſe ſpeaks† of this *determinate counſel and foreknowledge of God*, according to which Chriſt was delivered into the hands of wicked men. Since therefore Chriſt was foreknown from eternity, as one to be ſlain for the ſins of men, man's ſin was alſo neceſſarily foreknown.

XI. And if it was *foreknown*, it was alſo predetermined: as Peter, in the place juſt quoted, joins together *the determinate counſel and foreknowledge of God*. Nor can preſcience of future things be conceived in God, but in connection with his decree concerning their futurity.

* 1 Pet. i. 19, 20. † Acts ii. 23.

XII. From all this may be inferred, by a plain conſequence, that it could not otherwiſe happen, but that man ſhould fall on account of the infallibility of the divine preſcience, and of that neceſſity which they call a neceſſity of *conſequence*. For it is inconſiſtent with the divine perfection, that any decree of God ſhould be rendered void, or that the event ſhould not be anſwerable to it. 'Tis the prerogative of JEHOVAH to ſay, *My counſel ſhall ſtand.** His *counſels of old are faithfulneſs and truth.*† God himſelf has ratified the ſtability of his purpoſes by an oath, the more certainly to declare *the immutability of his counſel.*‡ *The Lord of hoſts hath ſworn, ſaying, Surely as I have thought, ſo ſhall it come to paſs; and as I have purpoſed, ſo ſhall it ſtand.*§

XIII. The infallibility of the event, as to man's ſin, may be proved by another argument; if we only attend to that ſubordination, by which all creatures depend on God in their operations. For it is not poſſible, that God ſhould, by his almighty concurrence, influence any creature to act, and yet that creature ſuſpend its acting. In like manner it is impoſſible, that while God does not influence to the moral goodneſs of that natural action, the creature ſhould, without that influx, perform that action morally good. This follows from the nature of God and the creature; as he cannot ineffectually influence his creatures to act, ſo they cannot but act, when under his influence. Theſe things being ſuppoſed, as they are evident to any perſon of attention, it is impoſſible, that man can abſtain from reaſoning, willing, and eating, where God influences to theſe acts by his almighty concurrence. Nor is it any more poſſible, that man can reaſon, will, and eat in a holy manner, if God, by his almighty concurrence, does not influence

* Iſ. xlvi. 10. † Iſ. xxv. 1. ‡ Heb. vi. 17. § Iſ. xiv. 24.

the holineſs of the action. Suppoſing therefore, that God had afforded his influence to the natural act of reaſoning, willing, eating, as he actually did, but not to the moral goodneſs of thoſe acts, as he did not; it could not otherwiſe be, but that man ſhould act at that time, and perform his action wrong. All this holds true, not only with reſpect to this firſt ſin of man, but with reſpect to all other ſins. As theſe things are matters of evident truth, I ſee not why we may not boldly maintain them, eſpecially as they tend to the glory of God, and to demonſtrate his ſuper-eminence, and the abſolute dependence of the creatures upon him, as much in their operations, as in their exiſtence. Should thoſe of the contrary Pelagian ſentiments pervert theſe truths, they will do ſo at their peril. Nor ought we ſo much to regard that, as on their account to conceal the truth.

XIV. However, it will not be amiſs to inſiſt a little longer on this ſubject; that all the apparent harſhneſs of this doctrine may be entirely removed by an evident demonſtration of the truth; which we think we ſhall be able to effect, by beginning with the more evident truths, in one continued chain of arguments, flowing from each other, in ſuch a manner, as to gain the aſſent even of the moſt obſtinate.

XV. And, firſt, I think it will be readily granted, that there is but one firſt cauſe; that all other cauſes ſo depend upon that firſt one, both in exiſting and acting, as without it to be able neither to exiſt nor to act. Paul inculcated this upon the Athenians;* *In him we live, and move, and have our being.* Nor, indeed, can the moſt powerful monarch in the world, ſuch as the Aſſyrian was in the time of Iſaiah, any more move without

* Acts xvii. 28.

God, than *the axe* without him *that heweth therewith*, or *the ſaw without him that ſhaketh it*.*

XVI. Reaſon, in this, concurs with ſcripture. For if there was any cauſe beſides God, which could act independently of him, it would follow, that there were more firſt principles than one; as Thomas Aquinas reaſons well.† Whoſe reaſoning, as it is both ſolid, and very much to the purpoſe, we ſhall not ſcruple to give in his own words. "It is," ſays he, "eſſential to the firſt principle, that it can act without the aſſiſtance and influence of a prior agent; ſo that if the human will could produce any action, of which God was not the author, the human will would have the nature of a firſt principle."

XVII. Though they endeavour to ſolve this, by ſaying, that, notwithſtanding the will be of itſelf capable of producing an action, without the influence of a prior agent, yet it has not its being from itſelf, but from another; whereas the nature of a firſt principle is to be ſelf-exiſtent. But it ſeems inconſiſtent to ſay, that what has not its being of itſelf, can yet act of itſelf; for what is not of itſelf, cannot continue of itſelf. For all the power of acting ariſes from the eſſence, and the operation from the power. Conſequently, what has its eſſence from another, muſt alſo have its power and operation from that other. And beſides, though this reply denies that it is *ſimply the firſt*; yet we cannot but ſee, that it is *the firſt agent*, if its acting cannot be referred to ſome prior agent, as the cauſe. Thus far Thomas Aquinas.

XVIII. Nor does God only concur with the actions of ſecond cauſes, when they act, but alſo influences the cauſes themſelves to act. Becauſe the begininng of actions depends, if not more, at leaſt not leſs on God,

* Iſ. x. 15. † In ſecond. ſentenent. diſtinct. 37. quæſt 2. art. 2.

than their progreſs. This opinion is not unhappily expreſſed in the Roman catechiſm, publiſhed by the decree of the council of Trent, at the command of Pope Pius V.* to this purpoſe: "But God not only, by his providence, preſerves and governs all things that exiſt; but he likewiſe, by a ſecret energy, ſo influences thoſe that move and act, to motion and action, that though he hinders not the efficiency of ſecond cauſes, yet he prevents or goes before it; ſeeing his moſt ſecret power extends to each in particular; and, as the wiſe man teſtifies, reaches powerfully from one end to the other, and diſpoſes all things ſweetly. Wherefore it was ſaid by the apoſtle, when declaring to the Athenians the God whom they ignorantly worſhipped: *He is not far from evey one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being.*"

XIX. Moreover, as a ſecond cauſe cannot act, unleſs acted upon, and previouſly moved to act, by the preventing and predetermining influence of the firſt cauſe; ſo, in like manner, that influence of the firſt cauſe is ſo efficacious, as that, ſuppoſing it, the ſecond cauſe cannot but act. For it is unworthy of God to imagine any concurrence of his to be ſo indifferent, as at laſt only to be determined by the co-operation of ſecond cauſes: *as if the rod ſhould ſhake him who lifts it up; or as if the ſtaff ſhould lift up what is not wood;*† for ſo the words properly run. And the meaning is, that it is highly abſurd to aſcribe to an inſtrument of wood, the raiſing and managing of what is not of ſuch vile matter as wood, but of a more excellent nature, namely ſpirit. By this allegory is intimated the abſurdity of that opinion, which makes God to be determined in his actions by the creature.

* Part. 1. de primo ſymboli articulo, num. 22. † Iſ. x. 15.

XX. Didacus Alvarez* makes uſe of the following argument againſt this; namely, The manner of concurring by a will of itſelf indifferent to produce this or the other effect, or its oppoſite, is very imperfect; becauſe, in its efficacy, it depends on the concurrence of a ſecond cauſe; and every dependence imports, in the thing which depends, ſome imperfection and inferiority, in reſpect of him on whom it depends; and therefore ſuch a manner of concurrence cannot be aſcribed to God, or agree with his will, which is an infinite and moſt perfect cauſe.

XXI. And then this inſolvable difficulty likewiſe remains: If the ſecond cauſe determines the concurrence of God in itſelf indifferent, in that act of determination it will be independent of God, and ſo become the firſt cauſe. And if in one action it can work independently of God, why not in a ſecond? If in the beginning of the action, why not alſo in the progreſs? Since the tranſition from non-acting to acting, is greater than the continuing an action once begun.

XXII. As theſe things are univerſally true, they obtain alſo in thoſe free actions of rational creatures, in which there is a moral evil inherent: namely, that creatures may be determined to thoſe actions by the efficacious influence of God, *ſo far as they are actions*, according to their *phyſical entity*. Elegantly to this purpoſe ſpeaks Thomas Aquinas, in the place juſt quoted. Since the act of ſin is a kind of being, not only as negations and privations are ſaid to be beings; but alſo as things, which in general exiſt, are beings, becauſe even theſe actions in general are ranked in that order, it would follow, that if the actions of ſin, as actions, are not from God, there would be ſome being which had not its eſſence from God: and thus God would not be the uni-

* De auxiliis divinæ gratiæ, lib. iii. diſp. 21. p. 163.

verſal cauſe of all beings. Which is contrary to the perfection of the firſt being.

XXIII. Neither does God only excite and predetermine the will of men to vicious actions, ſo far as they are actions; but he likewiſe ſo excites it, that it is not poſſible, but, thus acted upon, it ſhall act. For if, upon ſuppoſition of that divine influx, it was poſſible for the created will not to act, theſe two abſurdities would follow. 1. That the human will could baffle the providence of God, and either give to, or take from the divine influx all its efficacy. 2. That there could be ſome act in the creature, of ſuch weight as to reſiſt the divine influence, and be independent of God. For I do not imagine, they will ſay, that God concurs to the production of that action, whereby his influx is reſiſted. But we have already refuted any concurrence as in itſelf indifferent, to be determined by the free will of the creatures.

XXIV. Further, the free will of man excited to actions, cannot, according to its phyſical eſſence, give them a moral and ſpiritual goodneſs, without the divine providence influencing and concurring to that goodneſs. This is evident from what has been before ſaid. For as moral goodneſs is a ſuperior and more perfect degree of entity than a phyſical entity alone, and man in the phyſical entity of his actions depends on God; it is neceſſary, he ſhould much more depend on God, in producing the moral goodneſs of his actions; ſo that the glory thereof ought to be rendered to God, as the firſt cauſe.

XXV. If all theſe truths, thus demonſtrated, be joined and linked together, they produce that concluſion, which we laid down § 13. For if all creatures depend on God in acting; if he not only concurs with them when they act, but alſo excites them to act; if that excitation be ſo powerful, as that, upon ſuppoſing it, the

effect cannot but follow; if God with that same efficacy influences vicious actions, so far as they are physical; if the creature cannot give its actions their due moral goodness without God; it infalliably follows, that Adam, God moving him to understand, will, and eat, could not but understand, will and eat; and God not giving goodness to those actions, man could not understand and will in a right manner. Which was to be proved.

XXVI. Yet it does not hence follow, that man was obliged to what was simply impossible. For it is only a consequential and eventual infalliability and necessity, which we have established. God bestowed those powers on man, by which he could have overcome the temptation. Yet that faculty was such as became a creature; which since it was sufficient in its kind, yet could not proceed to action, without presupposing the divine concurrence. Who shall deny, that man has a locomotive faculty, so sufficient in its kind, that he requires no more? But will any affirm, that it can happen, that man, by that locomotive faculty, can actually move independently of God, as the first cause, without discovering his ignorance both of the supremacy of God, and the subordination of man? In like manner, we affirm, that God granted man such sufficient abilities to fulfil all righteousness, that he had no need of any further habitual grace, as it is called; yet so that all this ability was given him in such a manner, that he should act only dependently of the Creator and his influence, as we hinted, chap. ii. § 13.

XXVII. Much less should it be said, that man, by the above-mentioned acts of divine providence, was forced to sin. For he sinned with judgment and will; to which faculties, liberty, as it is opposed to compulsion, is so peculiar, nay essential, that there can be neither judgment nor will, unless they be free. And when

we affirm, that God foreordained and infalliably foreknew, that man would ſin freely, the ſinner could not but ſin freely; unleſs we would have the event not anſwer to the preordination and preſcience of God. And ſo far is the decree of God from diminiſhing the liberty of man in his acting, that, on the contrary, this liberty has not a more ſolid foundation than that infalliable decree of God.

XXVIII. To make God the author of ſin, is ſuch dreadful blaſphemy, that the thought cannot, without horror, be entertained by any Chriſtian. It is true indeed, that God created man mutably good, infalliably foreſaw his ſin, foreordained the permiſſion of that ſin, really gave man ſufficient powers to avoid it, but which could not act without his influx; and meanwhile influenced his faculties to natural actions, without influencing the moral goodneſs of thoſe actions. We learn all thoſe things from the event. But it is no leſs true, that God neither is, nor in any reſpect can be, the author of ſin. And though it be difficult, nay impoſſible for us, to reconcile theſe truths with each other; yet we ought not to deny what is manifeſt, on account of that which is hard to be underſtood. We will religiouſly profeſs both truths, becauſe they are truths, and worthy of God; nor can the one overturn the other; though, in this our ſtate of blindneſs and ignorance of God, we cannot thoroughly ſee the amicable harmony between them. This is not the alone, nor ſingle difficulty, whoſe ſolution the ſober divine will ever reſerve for the world to come.

XXIX. This is certain, that, by this permiſſion of ſin, God had an opportunity of diſplaying his manifold perfections. There is a fine paſſage to this purpoſe in Clemens,* which with pleaſure we here inſert. 'Tis the

* Strom. lib. i.

greateſt work of divine providence, not to ſuffer the evil ariſing from a voluntary apoſtaſy, to remain unuſeful, or in every reſpect to become noxious. For it is peculiar to divine wiſdom and power, not only to do good (that being to ſpeak ſo, as much the nature of God, as it is the nature of fire to warm, or of light to ſhine) but much more, to make the evil, deviſed by others, to anſwer a good and valuable end, and manage thoſe things which appear to be evil, to the greateſt advantage.

XXX. It remains now laſtly, to conſider, how, as Adam, in this covenant, ſtood as the head of mankind; upon his fall, all his poſterity may be deemed to have fallen with him, and broken the covenant of God. The Apoſtle expreſsly aſſerts this.* *By one man ſin entered into the world, and death by ſin; and ſo death paſſed upon all men, for that* in whom *all have ſinned*, EPH HO PANTES HEMARTON.

XXXI. To make the apoſtle's meaning more plain, we muſt obſerve theſe things. 1. It is very clear, to any not bewitched with prejudice, that when the apoſtle affirms, that all *have ſinned*, he ſpeaks of an act of ſinning, or of an actual ſin; the very term, *to ſin*, denoting an action. 'Tis one thing to ſin, another to be ſinful, if I may ſo ſpeak. 2. When he affirms *all* to have ſinned; he, under that univerſality, likewiſe includes thoſe who have no actual, proper, and perſonal ſin, and who, as he himſelf ſays, *have not ſinned after the ſimilitude of Adam's tranſgreſſion.*† Conſequently theſe are alſo guilty of ſome actual ſin, as appears from their death; which not being their own proper and perſonal ſin, muſt be the ſin of Adam, imputed to them by the juſt judgment of God. 3. By theſe words, EPH HO

* Rom. v. 12. † Ver. 14.

PANTES HEMARTON, *for that all have ſinned*, he gives the reaſon of that aſſertion, which he had before laid down, that, by the ſin of one man, death paſſed upon all. This, ſays he, ought not to aſtoniſh us, for all have ſinned. If this ſhould be underſtood of ſome perſonal ſin of each, either actual or habitual, the reaſoning would not have been juſt, and worthy of the apoſtle, but mere trifling. For his argument would be thus, that, by the one ſin of one, all were become guilty of death, becauſe each in particular had, beſides that one and firſt ſin, his own perſonal ſin: which is inconſequential. 4. The ſcope of the apoſtle is to illuſtrate the doctrine of juſtification, which he had before treated of. The ſubſtance of which conſiſts in this, that Chriſt, in virtue of the covenant of grace, accompliſhed all righteouſneſs for his choſen covenant-people, ſo that the obedience of Chriſt is placed to their charge, and they, on account thereof, are no leſs abſolved from the guilt and dominion of ſin, than if they themſelves had done and ſuffered, in their own perſon, all that Chriſt did and ſuffered for them. He declares, that, in this reſpect, Adam was the type of Chriſt, namely, as anſwering to him. It is therefore neceſſary, that the ſin of Adam, in virtue of the covenant of works, be ſo laid to the charge of his poſterity, who were comprized with him in the ſame covenant, that, on account of the demerit of his ſin, they are born deſtitute of original righteouſneſs, and obnoxious to every kind of death, as much as if they themſelves, in their own perſons, had done what Adam did. Unleſs we ſuppoſe this to be Paul's doctrine, his words are nothing but mere empty ſound.

XXXII. The laſt words of this verſe, EPH HO PANTES HEMARTON, are differently explained by divines, becauſe the Greek phraſeology admits of various

significations. The principal explanations are three. 1. Some render them, *in so far*, or, *because all have sinned.* For it is allowed, that EPH HO frequently admits this sense; and thus it seems to be taken,* EPH HO OU THELOMEN EKDUSASTHAI, *not for that we would be unclothed;* as if written, as Frobenius prints it, EPEIDE, though Beza here greatly differs. 2. Others observe, it may be explained, *with whom*, i. e. *who sinning, all have sinned.* For EPI in a similar construction denotes a time in which something was done. Thus we say in Greek, EP EMOI MEIRAKIO TOUTO GEGONE, *when I was a boy, this happened;* and EPI KUNI, *in the dog-days;* and the apostle,† EPI TE PROTE DIATHEKE, *under the first testament.* And then the meaning would be, that, upon Adam's sinning, all are judged to have sinned. 3. Augustine, and most of the orthodox have explained it, *in whom.* Which Erasmus in vain opposes, saying, that EPI when signifying *upon*, or, *in*, is joined to the genitive case; as EP OIKOU, KAI EPI TES CHORAS; also when denoting *time*, as EPI KAISAROS OCTABIOU. In all this he is strangely mistaken. For, not to say any thing now of *time*, it is certain, that EPI when joined to the dative, denotes *in:* as Matth. xiv. 8. EPI PINAKI, *in a charger;* and in this very context of Paul, ver. 14. EPI TO HOMOIOMATI, *in the similitude.* And which is more, TO EPH HO, cannot sometimes be otherwise explained, than by, *in which* or in whom; as Matth. ii. 4. EPH HO HO PARALUTIKOS KATEKEITO, *wherein the sick of the palsey lay;* and Luke v. 25. ARAS EPH' HO KATEKEITO, *took up that whereon he lay.* Nor is it taken in this light, in the sacred writings only, but he might learn from Budæus,‡ that Aristotle used this phraseology in the same sense,

* 2 Cor. v. 4. † Heb. ix. 15. ‡ In com. ling. Græc. p. 506.

EPH HO MEN HE THELEIA, EPI THATERO DE HO ARREN EPOAZEI, *On the one the female, on the other the male broods.* However, we reckon none of thoſe explanations to be impertinent, as they are all almoſt to the ſame purpoſe: yet we give the preference to the laſt, becauſe moſt emphatical, and very applicable to the apoſtle's ſcope. It is a bad way of interpreting ſcripture, to repreſent it as declaring what is the leaſt thing intended. For the words are to be taken in their full import, where there is nothing in the context to hinder it.

XXXIII. Grotius really prevaricates, when he thus comments on the paſſage before us. It is a common metonymy in the Hebrew, to uſe the word *ſin*, inſtead of *puniſhment;* and *to ſin*, inſtead of to *undergo puniſhment;* whence extending this figure, they are ſaid, by a metalepſis, CHATA *to ſin*, who ſuffer any *evil*, even though they are innocent, as Gen. xxxi. 36. and Job vi. 24; where CHATA is rendered by DUSPRAGEIN, *to be unhappy.* EPH HO, here denotes *through whom*, as EPI with the dative is taken, Luke v. 5. Acts iii. 36. 1. Cor. viii. 11. Heb. ix. 17. Chryſoſtom on this place ſays, "On his fall, they who did not eat of the tree, are from him all become mortal." Thus far Grotius.

XXXIV. This illuſtrious perſon ſeems to have wrote without attention, as the whole is very impertinent. 1. Though we allow, that ſin does ſometimes metonymically denote the *puniſhment* of ſin; yet we deny it to be uſual in ſcripture, that he who undergoes puniſhment, even while innocent, may be ſaid to ſin. Grotius ſays, it is frequent; but he neither does nor can prove it by any one example; which is certainly bold and raſh. Crellius, confuting his book on the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, brings in the ſaying of Bathſheba to David :* *I and my*

* 1 Kings i. 21.

ſon Solomon ſhall be counted offenders; that is, ſays he, *we ſhall be treated as offenders*, or *be ruined.* But *a ſinner*, or even *ſin*, and *to ſin*, are different things. The former is ſaid of Chriſt,* but not the latter, on any account. Moreover, to be a ſinner does not ſignify, in the paſſage alledged, to undergo puniſhment, without any regard to a fault or demerit, but to be guilty of aiming at the kingdom, and of high treaſon, and as ſuch to be puniſhed. The teſtimonies advanced by Grotius are ſo foreign, that they ſeem not to have been examined by that great man. For neither in the Hebrew do we find CHATA, *to ſin*, nor in the Greek verſion, DUSPRAGEIN; nor do the circumſtances admit, that what is there ſaid of ſin, or miſtake, can be explained of puniſhment. It is neceſſary therefore to ſuppoſe, that either Grotius had ſomething elſe in his view, or that here is a typographical error. 2. Though we ſhould grant, which yet we do not in the leaſt, that *to ſin* ſometimes denotes to undergo puniſhment; yet it cannot ſignify this here; becauſe the apoſtle in this place immediately diſtinguiſhes between death as the puniſhment, and ſin as the meritorious cauſe, *death by ſin.* And by this interpretation of Grotius, the apoſtle's diſcourſe, which we have already ſhewn is ſolid, would be an inſipid tautology. For where is the ſenſe to ſay, *So death paſſed upon all, through whom all die?* 3. Grotius diſcovers but little judgment in his attempt to prove, that EPH HO ſignifies *through whom:* certainly, Luke v. 5. EPI TO REMATI SOU, does not ſignify *through thy word*, but *at thy word*, or, as Beza tranſlates, *at thy command.* And Heb. ix. 17. EPI NEKROIS does not ſignify *through the dead*, but *when dead*, and rather denotes a circumſtance of time. Acts iii. 16. is alledged with a

* 2 Cor. v. 21.

little more judgment; and 1 Cor. viii. 11. not improperly. But it might be inſiſted, that EP EMOI ESTI ſignifies, *it is owing to me*, ſo that the meaning ſhall be, *to whom it was owing that all ſinned*. Which interpretation is not altogether to be rejected. Thus the ſcholiaſt, EPH HO ADAM, DI HON. And if there was nothing elſe couched under this, I would eaſily grant Grotius this explanation of that phraſeology. 4. It cannot be explained conſiſtently with divine juſtice, how without a crime death ſhould have paſſed upon Adam's poſterity. Proſper reaſoned ſolidly and elegantly againſt Collator.* "Unleſs perhaps it can be ſaid, that the puniſhment, and not the guilt paſſed on the poſterity of Adam; but to ſay this, is in every reſpect falſe. For it is too impious to judge ſo of the juſtice of God; as if he would, contrary to his own law, condemn the innocent with the guilty. The guilt therefore is evident, where the puniſhment is ſo; and a partaking in puniſhment ſhews a partaking in guilt; that human miſery is not the appointment of the Creator, but the retribution of the Judge." If therefore through Adam all are obnoxious to puniſhment, all too muſt have ſinned in Adam. 5. Chryſoſtom alſo is here improperly brought in, as if from Adam he derived only the puniſhment of death, without partaking in the guilt. For the homily, from which the words are quoted, begins thus: "When the Jew ſhall ſay, How is the world ſaved by the obedience of one, namely Chriſt? you may reply, How was the world condemned by one diſobedient Adam?" Where it is to be obſerved, (1.) That he ſuppoſes the miſeries of mankind to proceed from God, as a Judge, who cannot juſtly condemn, but for ſin. (2.) That he compares the condemnation of the world by Adam's diſobedience,

* 2 Cor. v. 20.

with its ſalvation by Chriſt's obedience. But this laſt is imputed to believers, and deemed to be theirs. And therefore Adam's ſin is in like manner imputed to all. As alſo Gregory of Nazianzen, quoted by Voſſius,* ſaid, that Adam's guilt was his. "Alas! my weakneſs!" ſays he, "for I derive my weakneſs from the firſt parent."

XXXV. But we only underſtand this of Adam's firſt ſin. We nowiſe agree with thoſe, who abſurdly tell us, that Adam's other ſins were alſo imputed to us: for Paul, when treating on this ſubject, Rom. v. every where mentions *tranſgreſſion*, in the ſingular number; nay expreſsly, ver. 18. *one tranſgreſſion*, by which guilt paſſed upon all. And the reaſon is manifeſt. For Adam ceaſed to be a federal head, when the covenant was once broken; and whatever ſin he was afterwards guilty of, was his own perſonal ſin, and not chargeable on his poſterity; unleſs in ſo far as God is ſometimes pleaſed to viſit the ſins of the fathers on the children. In which Adam has now nothing peculiar above other men. So much for the violation of the covenant by man.

* Hiſt. Pelag. lib. ii. part. 2. p. 163.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Abrogation of the Covenant of Works on the part of God.

HAVING diſcourſed at ſufficient length concerning the violation of the covenant of works by ſin; let us now conſider whether, and how far, it is made void, or *abrogated by God himſelf.*

II. And in the firſt place, we are very certain, that there are many things in this covenant of immutable and eternal truth; which we reckon up in this order. 1. The precepts of the covenant, excepting that probatory one, oblige all and every one to a perfect performance of duty, in what ſtate ſoever they are. 2. Eternal life, promiſed by the covenant, can be obtained upon no other condition, than that of perfect, and in every reſpect complete obedience. 3. No act of diſobedience eſcapes the vengeance of God, and death is always the puniſhment of ſin. But theſe maxims do not exclude a ſurety, who may come under engagements in man's ſtead, to undergo the penalty, and perform the condition. But of this it is not yet time to ſpeak. We ſhall now diſcourſe of each of them in order.

III. It is indeed a moſt deſtructive hereſy to maintain, that man, ſinful and obnoxious to puniſhment, is not bound to obedience. For, by no miſconduct of man, can God forfeit his right and ſupremacy. Now, this right and ſupremacy of God requires, that man, and even every creature, be ſubject in all reſpects to God, as far as poſſible. Moreover, the rational creature, ſuch as ſinful man is, and does continue to be, can be ſubject not only to the natural, but alſo to the moral, providence of God; nor only to his vindictive juſtice, but alſo to his legiſlative authority; and as he can, ſo he ought to be ſubject to him, as to the obligation of obedience: ſince every poſſible ſubjection is eſſential to the creature.

IV. If the ſinner, who deſerves puniſhment, was not ſubject to the law, he could no longer ſin; and therefore by one ſin he would ſet himſelf free from the danger of further ſinning. For where no law is binding, there is no tranſgreſſion, no ſin, which John defines to

be ANOMIA, *the tranſgreſſion of the law.** But nothing can be imagined more abſurd, than that man, by ſin, has acquired an impeccability, or an incapacity of ſinning.

V. Moreover, according to this hypotheſis, all ſinners would be equal, and an equal degree of puniſhment remain for every one: which is contrary both to ſound reaſon and ſcripture, where the inequality of ſins and puniſhment is ſo often inculcated.

VI. There is a plain paſſage, Gal. v. 3. which confirms, that, even by the promulgation of the new goſpel-covenant, the breakers of the covenant, who are without Chriſt, are not ſet free from that obligation of the law, which demands perfect obedience, but continue *debtors to do the whole law.*

VII. Nay, even in a human court, *the penal compact is deemed an additional compact, adding to the principal convention,* and conſequently not abrogating, but accumulating the former obligation. Much leſs, at the bar of God, can the obligation to puniſhment, ariſing from the violation of the covenant, abrogate the primary and principal obligation of the law, whereby the covenant was ratified.

VIII. Arminius therefore† very baſely refuſes, that God, when man once fell from the ſtate of innocence, and became obnoxious to puniſhment, even of right required obedience of man: as if God had forfeited his right by man's diſobedience. He makes uſe of theſe arguments. 1. Becauſe when man is in a ſtate of ſin, he is not in covenant with God: therefore there is no contract between God and man, by which he can require obedience: for by what reward, what puniſhment, can he give ſanction to the law, ſince man, for the diſobedience already committed, has forfeited the reward, and is become obnoxious to puniſhment? 2. As God

* 1 John iii. 4. † In epiſt. præſtantium virorum, p. 173.

has, becauſe of ſin, deprived man of ability and power to fulfil the law, ſo, by this very thing, he has ſignified that he will no longer require man to fulfil it, unleſs he reſtore his ability; nay, he cannot in juſtice do it. If any ſhall ſay, could therefore the creature be exempted from the right or authority of the Creator, ſo as no longer to be bound to obey him? He anſwers, Yes indeed, if the creature be accurſed, and the Creator reckon it unworthy to require obedience from it: for it is the higheſt puniſhment, ſo to conclude the ſinful creature under ſin, as not to require any more obedience from him; that being an evidence of irreconcileable anger; namely in that ſtate. 3. The law itſelf, which is to be performed, is ſuch as it would be unbecoming it ſhould be performed by a ſinner who is out of the favor of God. He is commanded to have God for his God, to love, honor, and adore him, to put his truſt in him, to uſe his name with reverence, &c. Is it probable, that ſuch an obedience is required of him, who is under the curſe of God? Thus far Arminius, whoſe arguments deſerve to be carefully examined.

IX. We begin with the firſt. Arminius ſuppoſes a great many things in this argument, which we cannot admit, ſuch as: that all the obligation of man ariſes from the covenant; that the law does not oblige, but in ſo far as it is enforced by rewards and puniſhments, that God cannot threaten a greater puniſhment, after man is once become obnoxious to the penalty: all which if we deny, as we do deny them, nay if we prove them to be falſe, as we hope to do, there will not remain the leaſt appearance of force in this argument. The obligation of man to obedience is not founded firſt and principally on a covenant, but in the ſupereminent ſovereignty, majeſty, and holineſs of God; and every rational creature,

becauſe he is ſuch, is wholly bound to be ſubject to his ſovereignty, adore his majeſty, and form himſelf according to the example of his holineſs. God would not be the abſolute ſovereign, if any rational creature exiſted, which was not bound to take the rule of its actions from him, and therefore, in regulating its actions, was not ſubject to God. God would not be the ſupreme majeſty, if there was any rational creature, who was not bound to acknowledge, worſhip, adore, and be ſubject to him in every reſpect. God would not be perfect holineſs, if any rational creature exiſted, which was not bound to acknowledge that holineſs, as moſt worthy of its imitation. As God is ſuch a being, he cannot but require to be eſteemed to be ſo. The creature cannot acknowledge him in this manner, without owning its obligation, at the ſame time to obey him, who is the firſt, the moſt high, and moſt holy God. Which we have already explained and proved more fully, chap. iii. ſect. 8. Moreover, it is not true, that the law is not binding, but becauſe of the ſanction of rewards and puniſhments. The principal obligation of the law ariſes from the authority of the lawgiver, to which is joined the perfect equity of all his commands. Though God had enforced his law neither by rewards nor puniſhments, we had been no leſs bound to obedience: leſt ſelf-love, whereby we are led to obtain the reward, and avoid the penalty, ſhould be the only motive to ſtir us up to obey God: the reverence of the Supreme Being, and the love of holineſs, are to hold the chief place here. In fine, it is alſo falſe, that no further puniſhment will be inflicted, after that man, having once broken the covenant, is become obnoxious to the penalty: for there are degrees in condemnation. And if that was true, it would not take off the obligation to obedience. It would not be lawful for a robber, condemned to be

burnt alive, or broken on the wheel, or to the moſt cruel death that man can deviſe, to commit, in the mean time, a new capital crime. For, as we have ſaid, the obligation ariſes neither primarily nor chiefly from the penal ſanction, but from the authority of the lawgiver.

X. To the ſecond, I anſwer, 1. Man himſelf is not only the meritorious, but alſo the phyſical cauſe of his own impotence, which he brought upon himſelf by his miſconduct; as if an inſolent and naughty ſervant ſhould put out the candle, by which he ought to carry on his maſter's buſineſs; or, by drinking to exceſs, willingly render himſelf unfit for the ſervice of his maſter. In this caſe, that maſter, does by no means, fall from his right of requiring every piece of ſervice properly due to him, and of puniſhing that naughty ſervant for non-performance. 2. Though God, as a juſt judge, had taken away from man ability to fulfil the law, yet, on that account, he both will, and in point of right can, require the performance of it by man. He can do this very juſtly; becauſe no wickedneſs of man, juſtly puniſhed by God, can diminiſh God's authority over him; otherwiſe it would be in man's power, at his own pleaſure, either to extend or limit the authority of God; which is contrary to the immutable perfection and bleſſedneſs of God. He alſo does require this for wiſe reaſons; of which this is one, that ſinful man may, by that means, be convinced of his irreparable miſery, upon finding ſuch things juſtly required of him, which he has rendered himſelf incapable to perform. And ſince he is as unwilling as unable to obey God, he is the more inexcuſable, the more clearly the duty of the law is inculcated upon him. 3. 'Tis abſurd to ſay, that it is the greateſt puniſhment that God inflicts on man, not to require obedience from the rebellious creature. It is indeed true, that the creature ought to reckon it a part of

its happineſs, that the glory of obeying is left to it. And it is the puniſhment of the creature, if, by the juſt judgment of God, it is condemned, never to perform what is incumbent upon it, and may be acceptable to God. But it is another thing to ſay, that God will not require obedience from it. If God requires not obedience, the creature owes none. If it owes none, it does not act amiſs by diſobeying; and if it does not amiſs by diſobeying, that cannot be in the place of the higheſt puniſhment for it. And thus Arminius himſelf cuts down his own vines (deſtroys his own argument.) He would have ſpoke rightly, had he ſaid, that it is inſtead of the higheſt puniſhment to the creature, to be condemned, by the juſt judgment of God, not to perform that obedience, which God, conſiſtently with his juſtice and holineſs, requires of it. 4. Should we deal more cloſely with a bold diſputant, we might ſay, that there is a contradiction in the adjunct, when he ſuppoſes God addreſſing the creature thus, I will not have thee to perform any obedience to me. For he that talks of obedience, preſuppoſes not only ſome authority, by which he can require it, but alſo a command, which requires obedience, and which muſt be obeyed. Whoever, by his authority, gives ſuch a comand, requires that obedience be yielded to it. If he give another command, the ſum of which is, I will not have you to obey me, he contradicts himſelf; nay, contradicts the nature of the command, which conſiſts in an obligation to obedience. 5. 'Tis the higheſt abſurdity imaginable, that a creature ſhall, by its ſin, obtain exemption from the authority of the Creator, and be no longer bound to obey him. If this is true, the firſt of all deceivers ſpoke truth, that men, by eating the fobidden fruit, would become as God. Whoever is exempted from the authority of the Creator, is under the authority of

none, is at his own diſpoſal; in fine, is God. For to be at one's own diſpoſal, is to be God. Ah! how ridiculous is this!

XI. The third argument is no leſs weak. For, 1. The ſum of the law is, to love God with all the heart, mind, and ſtrength, and our neighbour as ourſelves. As this is reaſonable in itſelf, ſo it cannot but be propoſed as ſuch by God to man; ſince conſcience itſelf, even that of the moſt abandoned, will bear witneſs with God to the reaſonableneſs of this. What? Is it not certain, that God is the chief good; conſequently the moſt amiable? Can he be unwilling, that any ſhould acknowledge him as the chief good, that is, what he really is, and what he cannot but be? Is he not the ſupreme majeſty? Can he be unwilling to be honored as ſuch, with the moſt ſubmiſſive reverence? 2. Arminius urges, that the law alſo commands us to truſt in God. It does ſo, ſay I; for what can be more right, what more becoming, than that man, even a ſinner, ſhould be bound to believe the teſtimony of God; ſhould give him this glory, namely, that he alone both can and will juſtify the ungodly; that he ſhould ſeek him even when angry; hunger and thirſt after his righteouſneſs; and willingly endeavour to be for his glory; namely, that God may be glorified and admired in him by his juſtification and glorification by free grace; and that he ſhould neither neglect the ſalvation, which God has moſt ſurely revealed, and neither deſpiſe nor reject the Saviour? This is to truſt in God: and will any pious perſon ever doubt of the probability, nay even of the moſt infallible certainty of this, that man under the curſe of God till now, is not obliged to this? 3. He will ſtill urge, that when he ſpeaks of truſting in God, he means thereby that full aſſurance of mind, whereby one holds God to be his God; that at leaſt this is alſo enjoined by the law. We

are to consider this more distinctly. When the law enjoins us to take God for our God, if it is to be understood in this sense, viz. to take him for our Creator, Preserver, Lawgiver, and Supreme Lord, it enjoins this absolutely and without distinction upon all men. But if we understand it thus, to take him for our saving good, this is enjoined upon none, but in that method which the revealed will of God prescribes. And this is the way either that man can obtain the salvation of God by a most perfect personal obedience, which was proposed to Adam in innocence, and is now impossible for the sinner: or that sinful man be converted, and united by faith to Christ; then examine himself, whether he be in the faith and in Christ; which being discovered, he may then indeed glory and exult in God his saving good: which way is now proposed in the gospel. But the law enjoins us to embrace every truth by faith, which God either has revealed, or shall reveal, and so to walk as it is agreeable to that truth. But the law has no where enjoined the impenitent sinner, to look upon God as the God of his salvation. Nay, the law, as it was given to Adam himself, enjoined him to believe the contrary. And thus I imagine I have fully dispatched the quaint subtleties of Arminius; that it is of immutable right, that man, even under sin and guilt, is still under obligation to obey the law.

XII. We must proceed a step further, and shew, that man, even after the breach of the covenant, continues bound not only to obedience, but to a *perfect* performance of duty. Paul said of those who are without the covenant of grace, that *they are debtors to do the whole law.** Nor can it be otherwise. For the law of the covenant, as to the natural precepts, is immutable, be-

* Gal. v. 3.

ing the tranſcript of the image of God, which is no leſs immutable than God himſelf. For if the image, which had the neareſt reſemblance, is changed, and yet continues ſtill to reſemble its archetype, or original, the archetype itſelf muſt alſo neceſſarily be changed. But the law of the covenant did undoubtedly require perfect obedience.

XIII. Moreover, if we imagine any abatement and relaxation of the law after ſin, we are to conceive, that God addreſſed ſinful man after this manner: "I formerly commanded thee to eſteem me as the ſupreme truth, thy chief good, and thy ſovereign Lord, and conſequently to aſſent, with the fulleſt aſſurance of faith, to all my precepts, to love me with all thy ſoul, and all thy powers, and eſteem nothing preferable to that which is acceptable to me, to employ thy all in my ſervice, at all times and in all things to be at my command and beck, and never venture on any thing, that is not agreeable to my will. But now, ſince thou haſt once preſumed to ſhew thyſelf diſobedient, I am ſatisfied, that, for the future, thou eſteem me indeed to be the truth, but not that which cannot deceive; to be thy good, but not the chief; to be thy Lord, but not the ſupreme: and I allow thee to doubt of ſome of my teſtimonies, to love other things beſides and above me; to place thy happineſs in other things than my favor; in fine, ſo to depend on me in ſome things, that in other things thou mayſt act at thy own diſcretion." If all theſe be abſurd and unworthy of God, as they certainly are; 'tis alſo abſurd and unworthy of God, to abate and relax any thing of his law. But if theſe general propoſitions are of immutable truth; that as God is the chief good, he is at all times and by all perſons to be beloved with the whole heart; as he is the ſupreme Lord, none can ever, under any pretence, act lawfully but accord-

ing to his command; now the moſt perfect performance of every duty, muſt be the manifeſt conſequence of all this.

XIV. Again, to perform duty perfectly, as every one will allow, is better than to do it in a ſlight manner. For all the goodneſs of duty conſiſts in its agreement with the rule and directory of it. There muſt therefore be a certain rule, enjoining that perfection, which is a greater degree of goodneſs. If ſuch a rule has been preſcribed by God, it muſt certainly bind men to conform themſelves to it.

XV. The conſcience of man, attending to himſelf, cannot but aſſent to theſe things. For elucidating this point, I ſhall ſubjoin two excellent paſſages, one from Epictetus, the other from the Emperor Julian. The former ſpeaks thus.* "Having found a rule, let us keep it inviolably, and not extend ſo much as a finger beyond it." The latter thus, *Orat.* i. "There is an ancient law given by him, who firſt taught mankind philoſophy, and which runs thus: that all who have an eye to virtue and to honeſty, ought, in their words and actions, in ſociety, and in all the affairs of this life, both ſmall and great, to have a regard to honeſty." The law therefore of the old covenant ſtill continues, binding all mankind, without exception, to a perfect performance of duty.

XVI. The *ſecond* thing, which we ſaid, ſect. 2. was immutable in the covenant of works, was this; that eternal life was not obtainable on any other condition, but that of perfect obedience: which is hence invincibly proved; becauſe, by virtue of this general rule, it was neceſſary for Chriſt *to be made under the law*,† and *fulfil all righteouſneſs*, and that for this end, *that the righte-*

* Diſſert. lib. ii. c. 11. † Gal. iv. 4.

*ouſneſs of the law might be fulfilled.** But if this righteouſneſs had not been ſacred and inviolable, Chriſt would have been under no neceſſity to ſubmit to the covenant of the law, in order to merit eternal life for his people. This therefore is evident, that there ought to be a merit of perfect obedience, on which a right to eternal life may be founded. Nor is it material, whether that perfect obedience be performed by man himſelf, or by his ſurety.

XVII. The *third* thing which we affirmed as an unchangeable truth, regards the penal ſanction; for the immutable and indiſpenſable juſtice of which we inſiſted above by ſo many arguments, chap. v. ſect. 18. & ſeq. ſo that there is no occaſion to add any thing further.

XVIII. Since then theſe three things, the law, the promiſe, and the threatening, conſtitute the entire nature of the covenant, as propoſed by God, if theſe ſtand on a firm footing, it ſeems to follow, that man has indeed, on his part, broken the covenant, but that no abrogation of the covenant is made on the part of God. But, on duly weighing the matter, we muſt acknowledge ſome abrogation even on the part of God. This may be evidently inferred from the ſubſtitution of the new covenant of grace. For thus the apoſtle has taught us to reaſon.† *In that he ſaith, A new covenant, he hath made the firſt old.* For though the abrogation of the old does not neceſſarily infer the ſubſtitution of a new; yet the ſubſtitution of a new does certainly import the abrogation of the old. It is indeed true, that the apoſtle, in that place, does not ſpeak preciſely of the covenant of works, but of the old œconomy of the covenant of grace, which he ſays is abrogated. Yet we pro-

* Rom. viii. 4. † Heb. viii. 13.

perly build on his reaſoning, which we both may and ought to apply alſo to this ſubject: namely, that every ſubſtitution of a new covenant ſuppoſes the abrogation of an old one.

XIX. That abrogation on the part of God conſiſts in this, that God has declared, that no man can, by virtue of this covenant, have friendſhip with him, or obtain eternal life; ſo that he has pronounced all to have forfeited the promiſe of the covenant, and the hope of enjoying that promiſe according to that covenant. This is what the apoſtle ſays, *that there is not now a law, which can give life, ſo that righteouſneſs ſhould be by the law.** To this purpoſe is *what the law cannot do*, which he inculcates.†

XX. And thus indeed that covenant is ſo abrogated, that it can on no account be renewed. For if we ſhould imagine God ſaying to man, "If, for the future, thou canſt perfectly keep my law, thou ſhalt thereby acquire a right to eternal life," he would not by ſuch words renew this very covenant of works. For ſin is now preſuppoſed to exiſt, which is contrary to that perfection of obedience, which the covenant of works requires. God would therefore tranſact here with man on a different condition, whereby, forgiving the former ſin, he would preſcribe a condition of an obedience leſs perfect than that which he ſtipulated by the covenant of works; which, excluding all ſin, even knew nothing of forgiveneſs of ſin. Nay, ſuch a tranſaction would be ſo far from a renewal of the covenant of works, that it would rather manifeſtly deſtroy it. For the penal ſanction makes a part of that covenant whereby God threatened the ſinner with death, which if he ſhould forgive him

* Gal. iii. 21. † Rom. viii. 3.

without a due satisfaction, he would act contrary to the covenant, and his own truth.

XXI. The law then remains as the rule of our duty; but is abrogated so far as to have no federal respect; nor can it occupy the place of a condition, by the performance of which man may acquire a right to the reward. In this sense the apostle says, *We are not under the law*,* namely, as prescribing the condition of life. There is indeed still an indissoluble connection between perfect righteousness and eternal life, so that *the last* cannot be obtained without *the first*. But after man, falling from righteousness, had lost hope of the reward, God was at liberty either to punish the sinner according to his demerit, or give him a surety to fulfil all righteousness in his stead.

XXII. There are learned men, who, besides this abolition of the covenant of works, which regards the possibility of giving life and justification, enumerate four other degrees of abolition in this order. 1. *As to condemnation*, by *Christ* being proposed in the promise, and apprehended by faith. 2. *As to terror*, or the power of the fear of death and bondage, by *the promulgation of the new covenant*, after the expiation of sin: which being once accomplished, they who are redeemed, are under the law of the Redeemer. So that the same law, abolished in the Redeemer as the law of sin, becomes the law of the Saviour, and adjudges righteousness to those who are his. 3. *As to the war* or struggle with sin, by *the death of the body*. 4. As to all *the effects* of it, by *the resurrection* from the dead.

XXIII. But let us give our reasons, why we have hitherto doubted, whether these things are with sufficient accuracy conceived and digested. 1. All the par-

* Rom. vi. 14.

ticulars here mentioned belong to the covenant of grace. Now, the covenant of grace does not abrogate, but ſuppoſes the abrogation of the covenant of works; becauſe there could be no place for this, without the abrogation of the other, in the ſenſe now mentioned. 2. The covenant of grace is not the abolition, but rather the confirmation of the covenant of works, in ſo far as the Mediator has fulfilled all the conditions of that covenant, ſo that all believers may be juſtified and ſaved according to the covenant of works, to which ſatisfaction was made by the Mediator. This is the apoſtle's meaning: *Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we eſtabliſh the law.** And again, *That the righteouſneſs of the law might be fulfilled in us.*† "Which ſignifies," (as the learned perſon, whoſe opinion we are now examining, comments on this place) "that what the law accounts for righteouſneſs is fully beſtowed on us; and conſequently, that what merits the reward of the law, becomes perfectly ours." 3. The very law of the covenant, which formerly gave up the human ſinner to ſin, when his condition is once changed by union with Chriſt the Surety, does now, without any abolition, abrogation, or any other change whatever, abſolve the man from the guilt and dominion of ſin, and beſtow on him that ſanctification and glorification, which are gradually to be brought to that perfection, which he ſhall obtain at the reſurrection of the dead; as being conſtrained to bear witneſs to the juſtification of the covenant of grace. This is what the learned perſon not improperly ſays, in the words we have juſt quoted: "So that the ſame law, aboliſhed in the Redeemer as the law of ſin, becomes the law of the Saviour, and beſtows righteouſneſs on thoſe who are his;" which he has at

* Rom. iii. 31. † Rom. viii. 4.

large and learnedly explained on Rom. viii. 2. In a word, the ſame law, which was to man in innocence a commandment to life, and is to man in ſin the law of ſin, giving him up to the dominion and guilt of ſin, becomes again in the Redeemer the law of the Spirit of life, teſtifying that ſatisfaction was made to it by the Redeemer, and beſtowing on man, who by faith is become one with the Redeemer, all the fruits of righteouſneſs for juſtification, ſanctification, and glorification. All the change is in the ſtate of the man, none in the law of the covenant, according to which man, in whatever ſtate he is, is judged. Which things ſeem not to have eſcaped the obſervation of the learned perſon himſelf; when he ſpeaks to this purpoſe.* "Nevertheleſs when we ſay this, we mean, that this fourfold *abolition and removal of the covenant concerning works to be done, which is connected with our own happineſs*, is founded on the ſame law: not that this could be done by virtue of the law in itſelf alone, but that the intervention of a Surety and Redeemer made it at laſt poſſible to the law." I allow, that what he calls the abolition of the covenant concerning works, is founded in the law of works: but I leave it to the reader's conſideration, whether it is not a ſtrange way of talking, to ſay, that "the abolition and removal of the law is founded on the law itſelf, and that the intervention of a Surety and Redeemer made it at laſt poſſible to the law;" namely, that itſelf ſhould effect its own abolition and removal? From all which I conclude, that it will be more proper to treat of theſe things, when we ſpeak of *the fruits and effects of the covenant of grace*, than when conſidering *the abolition of the covenant of works*; which is on no account aboliſhed, but in ſo far as it is become impoſſible for man to attain to life by his own proper works.

* Summa theol. c. 31, § 1.

THE

OECONOMY

OF THE

DIVINE COVENANTS.

BOOK II.

CHAP. I.

Introduction to treating on the Covenant of Grace.

THE *covenant of works being* thus *broken by the ſin of man*, and *abrogated by* the juſt *judgment of God*, wretched man was caſt headlong into the deepeſt gulf of ruin, whence he could not eſcape. While, liſtening to the ſolicitation of the devil, and giving way to his own reaſonings, he, in a moſt violent manner, *withdrew* himſelf from *God*, and would be *at his own diſpoſal*, throwing off his rightful ſubordination to God (like the prodigal ſon*) he *ſold* and enſlaved himſelf to *the devil*. All theſe were acts of the higheſt injuſtice. For *man* had no right thus *to diſpoſe of himſelf*; nor *the devil* to *accept* of what was *the Lord's*. Yet *God* conſidering, that, by this raſh and unjuſt action, man was juſtly puniſhed, did, by his righteous judgment, *ratify* all this for man's

* Luke xv. 12.

further punishment, gave man up to *himself*, as the most wretched and foolish of masters; and to *sin*, as a cruel tyrant, which would continually force him to every abominable practice. *And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient.** He also *gave them up unto vile affections*,† that so *they might receive in themselves that recompense which was meet.*‡ In fine, he delivered them up as slaves to *the devil*, to be *taken captive by him at his pleasure.*§ And all this according to that most equitable law; *Of whom a man is overcome, of the same he is brought in bondage.*‖

II. Add to this too, that man, after he ceased to be in covenant with God, became *without God, and without hope in the world.*¶ For it was impossible for man to devise any method becoming God, whereby, consistently with *divine truth, justice*, and *holiness*, he could be reconciled with God, and return again to his favor. The law of sin was also just, by which man was enslaved to sin, to the dominion and condemnation of it, and given up to the devil as his tormentor. In which sense, he is said to be not only *the captive of the devil, of the strong man*, mentioned Matth. xii. 29. but also *the captive of the lawful.*** For he had *the power of death*;†† and that by the law;‡‡ *the strength of sin is the law.* Nor could man contrive a method, whereby sin, which condemned, and that by the most equitable law, might itself be justly condemned by God.

III. But it pleased God, according to the riches of his unsearchable wisdom, to lay this breach of the legal covenant as a foundation for his stupendous works; by

* Rom. i. 28. † Ver. 26. ‡ Ver. 27. § 2 Tim. ii. 26. ‖ 2 Pet. ii. 19. ¶ Eph. ii. 12. ** Is. xlix. 24. †† Heb. ii. 14. ‡‡ 1 Cor. xv. 56.

ſetting up a new *covenant of grace*, in which he might much more clearly diſplay the ineſtimable treaſures of his all-ſufficiency, than if all things had ſucceeded well with man according to the firſt covenant: thus diſcovering, what ſeemed incredible, and to ſurpaſs comprehenſion, that the *true*, *juſt*, and *holy* God could, without at all diminiſhing, nay rather much more illuſtriouſly diſplaying his adorable perfections, become *the God* and *ſalvation of the ſinner*: finding out that admirable mixture of his ſtricteſt vindictive juſtice with his moſt condeſcending mercy, ſo that the one ſhould detract nothing from the other. For ſo illuſtrious an exerciſe of which perfections there could have been no place under the covenant of works.

IV. If therefore any thing ought to be accounted worthy of our moſt attentive conſideration, certainly it is the covenant of grace, of which we now attempt to treat. Here the way is pointed out to a paradiſe far preferable to the earthly, and to a more certain and ſtable felicity than that from which Adam fell. Here a new hope ſhines upon ruined mortals, which ought to be the more acceptable, the more unexpected it comes. Here conditions are offered, to which eternal ſalvation is annexed; conditions, not to be performed again by us, which might throw the mind into deſpondency; but by him, who would not part with his life, before he had truly ſaid, *It is finiſhed.* Here with the brighteſt ſplendour ſhine forth the wonderful perfections of our GOD, his wiſdom, power, truth, juſtice, holineſs, goodneſs, philanthropy, or good-will to man, mercy, and what tongue can rehearſe them all? never before diſplayed on a more auguſt theatre, to the admiration of all who behold them. Whoever therefore loves his own ſalvation, whoever deſires to delight himſelf in the contemp-

lation of the divine perfections, muſt come hither, and deeply engage in holy meditations on the covenant of grace: which I think may not improperly be thus defined.

V. *The covenant of grace is an agreement, between God and the elect ſinner; God declaring his free good-will concerning eternal ſalvation, and every thing relative thereto, freely to be given to thoſe in covenant, by and for the ſake of the Mediator Chriſt; and man conſenting to that good-will by a ſincere faith.*

CHAP. II.

Of the Compact between God the Father and the Son.

THAT the nature of *the covenant of grace* may be the more thoroughly underſtood, two things are above all to be diſtinctly conſidered. 1. The *compact* which intervenes between *God the Father*, and *Chriſt the Mediator*. 2. That *teſtamentary diſpoſition*, by which *God beſtows*, by an immutable covenant, *eternal ſalvation*, and every thing relative thereto, upon *the elect*. The former agreement is between *God* and *the Mediator*; the latter between *God* and *the elect*. This laſt preſuppoſes the firſt, and is founded upon it.

II. When I ſpeak of the compact between *the Father* and *the Son*, I thereby underſtand *the will of the Father*, giving *the Son*, to be the *Head* and *Redeemer* of the elect; and *the will of the Son* preſenting himſelf as a *Sponſor* or Surety for them; in all which the nature of a compact and agreement conſiſts. The ſcripture repreſents *the Father*, in the œconomy of our ſalvation, as *demanding the obedience of the Son* even unto death,

and for it promiſing him that name, which is above every name, even that he ſhould be the head of the elect in glory: but *the Son*, as *preſenting himſelf* to do *the will* of the Father, *acquieſcing* in that *promiſe*, and in fine, requiring *the kingdom* and *glory promiſed* to him. When we have clearly demonſtrated all theſe particulars from Scripture, it cannot on any pretence be denied, that there is a compact between the Father and the Son, which is the foundation of our ſalvation. But let us proceed diſtinctly. 1. By producing ſuch places of ſcripture, as ſpeak in general indeed, but yet expreſsly, of this compact. 2. By more fully unfolding the particulars, which complete or conſtitute this compact. 3. By invincibly proving the ſame from the nature of the ſacraments, which Chriſt alſo made uſe of.

III. Chriſt himſelf ſpeaks of this compact in expreſs words.* KAGO DIATITHEMAI HUMIN, KATHOS DIETITHETO MOI HO PATER MOU BASILEIAN, *And I engage by covenant unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath engaged by covenant unto me.* In which words the Lord Jeſus ſays, that by virtue of ſome covenant or diſpoſition, he obtains a kingdom, as we alſo obtain it by virtue of the ſame.

IV. And Heb. vii. 22. where he is ſaid to be KREITTONOS DIATHEKES ENGUOS, *a ſurety of a better covenant* or *teſtament*. But he is called the Surety of a teſtament, not principally on this account, becauſe he engages *to us for God* and his promiſes, or becauſe he engages *for us* that *we ſhall obey*; as Moſes intervened as a ſurety between *God* and *the Iſraelites*.† For by how much Chriſt was greater than Moſes, in ſo much he was alſo a Surety in a more excellent manner. His ſuretiſhip conſiſts in this, that *he took upon himſelf to*

* Luke xxii. 29. † Exod. xix. 3.—8.

perform that condition, without which, consistently with the justice of God, the grace and promises of God could not reach unto us; and which being performed, they were infallibly to come to the children of the covenant. Unless then we would make void the suretiship of Christ, and gratify the Socinians, the very worst perverters of scripture, it is necessary we conceive of some covenant, the conditions of which Christ took upon himself; engaging in our name with the Father, to perform them for us; and which having performed, he might engage to us for the Father, concerning grace and glory to be bestowed upon us.

V. Moreover,* Paul mentions a certain DIATHEKEN, *covenant*, or *testament*, *that was confirmed before of God in Christ.* Where the contracting *parties* are, on one side *God*, on the other *Christ*; and *the agreement* between both is ratified. But lest any should think, that Christ is here only considered as the *executioner* of the *testament* bequeathed to us by God, the apostle twice repeats, that *Christ was* not *promised to us*, or that *salvation was not promised to us through Christ*, though that be also true; but that *the promises were made to Christ himself.*† That Christ *was that seed*, HO APENGELTAI, *to which he had promised*, or *to which the promise was made*; namely, concerning the inheritance of the world, and the kingdom of grace and glory. It is evident therefore, that the word DIATHEKE does here denote some *covenant* or *testament*, by which something is promised by God to Christ. Nor do I see what can be objected to this, unless by *Christ* any one should understand *the head*, together with *the mystical body*, which with Christ is that one seed, to which the promises are made. This indeed we shall very readily admit, if it

* Gal. iii. 17. † Ver. 16.

alſo be admitted, that Chriſt, who is the head, and eminently the ſeed of Abraham, be on no account excluded from theſe promiſes, eſpecially as the promiſes made to his myſtical body, ought to be conſidered as made alſo to himſelf; ſince he himſelf too *hath received gifts for* [*in*] *men.**

VI. Nor ought thoſe places to be omitted, in which explicit mention is made of *the ſuretiſhip* of Chriſt; as Pſal. cxix. 122. *Be ſurety for thy ſervant for good;* that is, as ſurety receive him *into* thy protection, that it may be well with him. In like manner, If. xxxviii. 14. *I am oppreſſed, undertake for me;* be to me a ſurety and patron. And that none but Chriſt alone could thus undertake, God himſelf ſays, Jer. xxx. 21. *Who is this* NGARAB ÆIH LIBBO *that engaged* [*in*] *his heart*, or quieted his heart by his ſuretiſhip, or *ſweetened his heart* by a voluntary and fiducial engagement, or, in fine, *pledged his* very *heart*, giving his ſoul as both the matter and price of ſuretiſhip (for all theſe things are compriſed in the emphaſis of the Hebrew language) *to approach unto me*, that he may expiate ſin? Theſe words alſo point out what that ſuretiſhip or undertaking was, which David and Hezekiah fought for; namely, a declaration of will to approach unto God, in order to procure the expiation of ſins.

VII. In fine, we may refer to this point, what is to be found, Zech. vi. 13. *The counſel of peace ſhall be between them both;* namely, between the *man*, whoſe name is *the Branch*, and Jehovah: for no other pair occur here. It will not be foreign to our purpoſe, to throw ſome light on this place by a ſhort analyſis and paraphraſe. In this and the preceding verſe, there is a remarkable prophecy concerning the Meſſiah, whoſe *per-*

* Pſal. lxviii. 19.

ſon, *offices*, and *glory*, the prophet truly deſcribes in a ſhort, but lively manner, ſubjoining at laſt *the cauſe* of all theſe; why the Meſſiah ſhewed himſelf as ſuch a *perſon*, executed ſuch *offices*, and obtained ſuch a *glory*; namely, that *counſel*, which was between *him* and the *Father*, the fruit of which, with reſpect to us, is *peace*. Of *the perſon* of the Meſſiah he ſays, that he is ISH, the *man*, that is, *true* man; compare Hoſ. ii. 15. and indeed, *the moſt eminent* among men; not ADAM or ANISH, which words denote *wretched man*, but ISH JEMINÆCHA *the man of the right hand of God*.* Becauſe Chriſt is not here conſidered as in the abaſement of his miſery, but in the excellence of his glory. His name is the *Branch*, becauſe ſprung from God,† a new root of a new offſpring, or of the ſons of God according to promiſe and regeneration, the ſecond Adam. And indeed a *branch*, which *ſhall bloſſom from under himſelf*. Aben Ezra, MILO, *from himſelf*, which ſhall not be produced or propagated by any ſowing, or planting of man's hand, but ſhall ſpring from a *virgin*, by the peculiar power of the Deity. His *office* is *to build the temple of the Lord*, that is, the church of the elect, *which is the houſe of God*,‡ which Chriſt KATESKEUASE, *framed*,§ and built;‖ laying the foundation in his croſs, and giving his blood for cementing it. But becauſe in the ſame breath it is twice ſaid, *He ſhall build the temple of the Lord*, it may ſuggeſt to our minds, whether, beſides the building of the church, which is *the myſtical body* of Chriſt, the reſurrection of Chriſt's own *natural body* may not be intended, which is called *the building of the temple*.¶ This being done, *he will receive majeſty*, a name above every name, and *ſit on the throne of God*, to execute his kingly and prieſtly office in glory. *For a*

* Pſal. lxxx. 17. † Iſ. iv. 2. Zech. vi. 12. ‡ 1 Tim. iii. 15.
§ Heb. iii. 4. ‖ Matth. xvi. 18. ¶ John ii. 19, 21.

king to ſit on a throne, is nothing ſtrange, but *for a prieſt*, very much ſo; being contrary to the cuſtom of the ancient prieſts in the Old Teſtament, who *ſtood* daily, often offering the ſame ſacrifices; becauſe their labour was ineffectual to remove the guilt of ſin.* But Chriſt having once offered up the one ſacrifice of himſelf, and by it obtained eternal redemption, *ſat down* for ever at the right hand of the Father, never to riſe to offer a ſecond time.† He now does what his ſeſſion gives him a right to do, to make interceſſion for his people;‡ as was ingeniouſly obſerved by James Altingius.§ But whence do all theſe things proceed, and what is the origin of ſuch important matters? *The counſel of peace*, which is between *the man whoſe name is the Branch*, and between Jehovah, whoſe temple he ſhall build, and on whoſe throne he ſhall ſit.‖ And what elſe can this *counſel* be, but *the mutual will of the Father and the Son*, which, we ſaid, is the nature of the covenant? It is called a *counſel*, both on account of the free and liberal good pleaſure of both, and of the diſplay of the greateſt wiſdom manifeſted therein. And a counſel of *peace*, not between God and Chriſt, between whom there was no enmity; but of peace to be procured to ſinful man with God, and to ſinners with themſelves.

VIII. Two things here may ſeem to be objected to, which we are briefly to anſwer. 1. That by thoſe *two* we are not to underſtand *the Father* and *the Son*, but the Jews and the Gentiles. 2. That here it is not the *counſel*, which is *the original* and *cauſe* of all theſe things, and which ought to have been expreſſed in *the preterperfect* or *preſent tenſe*; but the counſel, which is *the fruit* of Chriſt's interceſſion, of which the prophet ſpeaks in *the future tenſe*. To *the firſt* I anſwer, That this expoſition

* Heb. x. 11. † Heb. i. 3. and ix. 12, 14. ‡ Rom. viii. 34.
§ Hept. iii. diſſert. 6. § 49. ‖ Rev. iii. 21

is aſſerted, but not proved. There is no diſtinct mention made of Jews and Gentiles in the preceding verſes of this chapter. And it is not lawful for us to cram any thing into the text. What others alledge concerning a prieſt and king, or the office of prieſt and king, or about the Jews of Jeruſalem and Babylon, is quite forced. "Our explication," ſays the very learned de Dieu, who here is of the ſame opinion with us, "appears ſimple and plain." Neither is it new, ſince Jerome tells us, that this verſe was underſtood of the Father and the Son. To *the ſecond* I reply, That there is nothing that can oblige us to aſſent to it; ſince the words, by our analyſis and explanation, yield a very juſt and profitable ſenſe; and this covenant could not be expreſſed by a more ſignificant term, than that of a mutual counſel between the Father and the Son. What is added with reſpect to the difference of tenſes, ſeems to be of ſmall moment: for that the tenſes in Hebrew are often put one for the other, and *the future* for *the preſent*, none can be ignorant of, but they who are indifferently ſkilled in that language. See Pſal. xvii. 3. TZERAPHTANI BAL TIMIZA, *Thou haſt tried me*, and *thou doſt*, or *didſt find nothing*; literally, *thou ſhalt find*. Such changes of tenſes often occur in the ſame pſalm. Beſides, ſomething is then ſaid to be done in ſcripture, when it is declared to be ſolemnly done; of which inſtances are to be met with every where. See acts ii. 36. We will therefore properly explain the words thus, *The counſel of peace is between both*. Or if you entirely inſiſt on *the future tenſe*, the meaning will be this: At the exaltation of Chriſt, and the peace advanced by him from heaven, there will be a manifeſt execution of this counſel. But there is no occaſion to come to this. For if we interpret this counſel, of that agreement, which ſubſiſted between the Father and Chriſt, God-man, when, aſſum-

ing human nature, he began to do the office of Surety: the prophet might and ought to ſpeak of it in the future tenſe. And he does ſo in an elegant order, aſcending from the effects to the cauſe, in this manner: Chriſt, God-man, ſhall build the ſpiritual temple of the Lord; for a glorious reward of which office he ſhall receive majeſty, and ſhall ſit on the throne of the Lord. Nor ought this to ſeem ſtrange: for Chriſt, clothing himſelf with human fleſh, will, by a certain compact on which our peace reſts, promiſe to the Father, that he will do ſo; and the Father, on the other hand, will promiſe him, that he will thus reward that ſervice. In this manner every thing runs ſmoothly. See what ſhall be ſaid more largely, chap. iii. § 2.—4.

IX. It is alſo a proof of this, that Chriſt, often in the pſalms and elſewhere, calls God the Father *his God*; ſee among other places, Pſal. xxii. 3. and xlv. 8. Iſ. xlix. 4. 5. and John xx. 17. Which is the form or manner of the covenant. In this ſenſe Jacob promiſed, that *the Lord ſhould be his God*;* that is, that he would ſo frame his whole life, as became one in covenant with God. The Iſraelites alſo, when they ſolemnly renewed the covenant, Joſ. xxiv. 18. ſaid, *We will ſerve the Lord, for he is our God.* In like manner God promiſes in the covenant, that he will be *the God* of his *covenant-people*; that is, diſplay the riches of his all-ſufficiency for their ſalvation.† *This is my covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael, I will be their God.* Deut. xxvi. 17. *Thou haſt vouched the Lord* (thou haſt made the Lord ſay) *this day to be (that he will be) thy God.* The very meaning of the word [which we render God] implies this: for ELOAH, derived from

* Gen. xxviii. 21. † Jer. xxxi. 33.

ALAH, *he ſwore* or *adjured*, denotes him, whoſe prerogative it is to bind us, by oath, to love and faithful obedience to him, and to whom we ought, by oath, to give all obedience; and who on his part engages that he will be all-ſufficient to his faithful ſervants for ſalvation. He therefore who profeſſes Eloah to be his God, does at the ſame time, by virtue of the covenant of God, call himſelf *the ſervant of God;* for NGÆBÆD, *ſervant*, is the correlate of ELOAH, or, ELOHIM: as Pſalms, lxxxvi. 2. HOSHANG NGABDECHA ATTAH ÆLOHAI, *Preſerve thy ſervant, O thou my God.* And in this manner *the Father* calls *Chriſt*, in many places, *his ſervant*, If. xlix. 5, 6. Beſides, ſuch a one profeſſes, that he entirely depends on the promiſe and teſtimony of that covenant: in which things the whole nature and deſign of the covenant conſiſts. Since therefore *Chriſt* calls God the Father *his God*, and, on the other hand, *the Father* calls *Chriſt his ſervant*, both of them do, by that name, indicate a compact concerning obedience and reward.

X. But let us now proceed more particularly, and diſcuſs all *the parts* of this covenant, that it may not only appear that there ſubſiſts ſome covenant between Chriſt and the Father, but what that covenant is, and of what nature. *The contracting parties* are, on the one hand, *the Father*, whom Chriſt calls *my Lord;** on the other, *the Son*, whom the Father calls *his ſervant.*† *The law of the covenant* is propoſed by *the Father;*‡ *This commandment have I received of my Father;* and,§ *The Father which ſent me, he gave me a commandment.* To that law *a promiſe* is added by the Father;‖ *When thou ſhalt make his ſoul an offering for ſin (when his ſoul ſhall make itſelf an offering for ſin) he ſhall ſee his ſeed,*

* Pſal. xvi. 2. † If. liii. 11. ‡ John x. 18. § John xii. 49.
‖ If. liii. 10.—12.

&c. and,* *It is a light thing, that thou ſhouldſt be my ſervant, to raiſe up the tribes of Jacob, &c. On performing* that *law, the Son acquires a right* to aſk the reward ;† *Aſk of me, and I ſhall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion.* Thus far *the propoſal of the covenant* on *the part of the Father ; the acceptance on the part of the Son* conſiſts in this ; that he willingly ſubmitted himſelf to *the law* of the covenant ;‡ *Mine ear haſt thou* (bored) *opened ;* that is, thou haſt engaged me as a willing ſervant to thyſelf, having agreed about the reward. *Then ſaid I, Lo ! I come, I delight to do thy will ; yea, thy law is within my heart.* See alſo John xiv. 31. Nor did the Son only *take* this upon himſelf, but actually *performed* it, *being made of a woman, made under the law.*§ *I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love :* and John viii. 29. *I do always thoſe things that pleaſe him.* Nor did he part with his life, till he had truly ſaid, TETELESTAI, *It is finiſhed.*‖ In the courſe of this obedience, the Son *comforted* himſelf in *the faithfulneſs of the Father*, to accompliſh his *promiſes ; I ſaid, Surely my judgment* (reward) *is with the Lord, and* (the recompenſe of) *my work with my God.*¶ And when he drew near the end of his courſe, *he claimed*, with great confidence of mind, the reward promiſed him ;** *I have glorified thee on earth : I have finiſhed the work, which thou gaveſt me to do. And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.* What, pray, can be ſuppoſed wanting to complete the form of a covenant, which we have not here ?

XI. In fine, all theſe things may be confirmed from this, that Chriſt likewiſe made uſe of the ſacraments ;

* Iſ. xlx. 6.—8. † Pſal. ii. 8. ‡ Pſal. xl. 7.—9. § Gal. iv. 4. John xv. 10. ‖ John xix. 30. ¶ Iſ. xlix. 4. ** John xvii. 4. 5.

not only as to *the matter* of these institutions, as they were commands divinely enjoined, the observance of which had a respect to virtue; but as to *the form*, as they were *signs and seals of the covenant; God the Father*, by the use of them, sealing to *the Son the federal promise* concerning *justification from sins*, not *his proper and personal sins, either of commission or omission* (for such he had none*) but from those, which, by a voluntary engagement, *he took upon himself* as his own, and from which, as *Surety he was justified in the spirit*,† and also concerning *life eternal*, to be bestowed on him and his; and *God the Son*, in the use of them, acknowledging himself a debtor to fulfil all righteousness: as these things have been learnedly observed and explained by these celebrated gentlemen Voetius‡ and Essenius.§ But let us illustrate this by an example. In *the baptism* of Christ, there was an evident sealing of the covenant on both sides. Christ declared, that it was his province *to fulfil all righteousness*. To that *he bound himself by baptism*; telling John upon his refusing to baptize him, *Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness*.‖ *The Father* declared, that *he accepted the suretiship; In thee I am well pleased*;¶ and put him in mind of the inheritance, *Thou art my Son*. And all these things *he sealed* by *the symbol of the Holy Ghost* descending upon him.

XII. As these things are evident, and contain a demonstration of the truth to the conscience, I would not have Ps. xvi. 2. strained to this purpose: *Thou hast said unto the Lord, Thou art my Lord* TOBATHI BAL NGALÆCHA, *my goodness (is not upon thee) extendeth not to*

* 2 Cor. v. 21. 1 Pet. ii. 16. † 1 Tim. iii. 16. ‡ Disput. de fide Christi. ejusque sacramentorum usu, disput. ii. p. 160. § De subjectione Christi. ad legem divinam, c. 10. § 11. ‖ Mat. iii. 16. ¶ Luke iii. 22.

thee: as if in these words there was an address of God the Father to the Son, to this purpose: I require nothing more of thee, as a satisfaction to me, in order to display my grace. For thus a learned author paraphrases these words. *Thou had said to the Lord*, &c. Thou Son of man, hast acknowledged, that Jehovah is the Lord, and, as a servant, hast engaged obedience to him. Thou, by loving and obeying even unto death (to which thou offerest thyself) hast declared me to be Lord, and honored me with a perfect obedience. As to any advantage to be obtained, *my goodness*, that is, my grace, and the benefits depending thereon, *extendeth not to thee*, [is not upon thee;] that is, *thou art*, TETELEIOMENOS, an absolute and perfect Saviour. What was laid upon thee, or what thou wast bound by suretiship to perform, that my goodness might extend to mankind, that thou hast performed. I accept of it. Thus NGAL generally denotes something due, both among the Hebrews, and in the sacred writings.

XIII. But I think, these things are strained, and do not run with proper smoothness. For, 1. There is nothing which obliges us to imagine, unless we incline to do so, that there is contained in these words *an address of God the Father to the Son;* since the whole of this psalm has not the least appearance of a dialogue, but only represents a single person, speaking in one continued discourse, whom Piscator, by weighty arguments, proves to be the Lord Jesus. The learned person himself speaks thus: "This discourse may certainly be ascribed to the Son, as addressing himself." And therefore I say, it is certainly possible, that this discourse cannot contain the approbation of the Father acquiescing in the obedience of the Son. For if the Son addresses his own soul, which said to Jehovah, *Thou art my Lord, and my goodness extendeth not to* [*is not upon*]

thee ; doubtleſs the Son ſaid this to the Father, and not the Father to the Son. 2. I own, that theſe words, which the Son ſays to the Father, or the Father to the Son, are ſo emphatical, that they cannot, in their full ſignification, be ſuppoſed to be ſpoken by either of them to the other, on account of the *peculiar excellence* which is in the Son.* But I queſtion, whether any can be eaſily perſuaded, that the approbation of the moſt perfect obedience of the Son, and the acquieſcence of the Father therein, are expreſſed in ſuch ſlender terms, *Thou haſt ſaid, Thou art my Lord.* I appeal to any, who *teaches* [*underſtands*] *the good knowledge of the Lord*, as it is ſaid of the Levites,† whether thoſe words of ſcripture be ſuch, as "that no one can deviſe any thing more proper to illuſtrate that ſenſe," which the very learned perſon elſewhere requires, before he acquieſces in the meaning aſſigned.‡ 3. It is very true, that NGAL ſometimes, among the Hebrews, ſignifies ſomething due. The very learned de Dieu§ has long ago obſerved this, from the writings of the Hebrews, and alſo of the Arabs. But that ſignification does not ſeem proper to this place. For *Chriſt was* neither *indebted to God for his goodneſs*, or grace, and the bleſſings depending upon it ; nor *did he* properly *owe the grace* of God to *believers*. But, by virtue of a compact, *he owed obedience* to God ; which being performed, *God owed to Chriſt*, and *to them who are Chriſt's, the reward* promiſed by the compact, which is given to Chriſt as a due debt. The ſignification of *being due* might be inſiſted upon, had it been ſaid, *My law*, or *ſatisfaction to my juſtice*, or ſomething to that purpoſe, *is no more upon thee* [*no longer extendeth to thee.*] But we muſt fetch a ſtrange compaſs to make theſe words, *My goodneſs extendeth not to* [is not upon] *thee*,

* Heb. i. 4. † 2 Chron. xxx. 22. ‡ Sum. theol. c. iii. § 30.
§ In Gen. xvi. 5.

to ſignify, *Thou art no longer indebted to my goodneſs;* and again, that the meaning of them ſhould be, "Thou haſt done every thing, to which thou waſt bound, that my goodneſs might be extended to men." And I verily doubt, whether it could ever come into any one's mind, that "ſuch an explication is the fulleſt, the moſt ſimple, and moſt ſuited to the connection; in fine, that it is ſuch, that none who compares it with the words of ſcripture, can deviſe a more happy manner of expreſſing the thing; and that therein an inexpreſſible degree of light, truth, and wiſdom, may be diſcovered." For theſe are laws of interpretation, which the very learned perſon himſelf has laid down.*

XIV. 4. Another ſenſe may be fairly brought from the words of the pſalm, which has nothing either harſh or ſtrained, and contains what is becoming the wiſdom of God, in this manner: The Lord Jeſus, being deeply engaged in holy meditations, addreſſes his ſoul, that is, himſelf; and declares, that, while in his meditation, he ſaid to JEHOVAH the Father, *Thou art the Lord*, all-ſufficient to and by thyſelf for all happineſs. Wherefore by this whole work of my mediation, and conſequently by all my obedience, no acceſſion of new or greater happineſs is made to thee, nor canſt thou be enriched by my ſatisfaction. *My goodneſs extendeth not to thee:* thou receiveſt no benefit thereby. All the fruit of my ſatisfaction redounds to thy pious and choſen people. See Job xxii. 2. & xxv. 7. The comment of Ben Nachman on the former place is elegant, agreeing very much with the phraſeology in our text. "He declares, that no addition of good is made to God, when any good is done." All theſe words contain a ſalutary truth, inſtructing us concerning *the all-ſufficiency of God*,

* Sum. theol. c. vi. § 38.

to whom no new good can accrue from any quarter, and concerning *the fruit of Chriſt's ſatisfaction*, as redounding to the godly; and are moſt adapted to the words and analogy of the whole pſalm. For NGAL many times in ſcripture ſignifies the ſame as ÆL, *to*. I ſhall produce a place or two, which occurred to me, when meditating on theſe things in reading the ſcriptures. What Micah ſays,* VENAHARU NGALAV NGAMMIM *and people ſhall flow unto it;* this Iſaiah expreſſes as follows,† VENAHARU ELAV CAL HAGGOIM, *and all nations ſhall flow unto it.* Where ÆL and NGAL are taken in the ſame ſignification. In like manner,‡ *wrote letters* NGAL ÆPHRAIM, that is, to the Ephraimites. 'Tis ſtill more to the purpoſe, what we have 1 Sam. i. 10. VATTITHPALLEL NGAL JEHOVAH, *prayed unto the Lord;* and Pſal. xviii. 41. *They cried*, NGAL JEHOVAH, *unto the Lord, but he anſwered them not.* Sometimes it ſignifies the ſame thing, as TZAD *up to*, or *quite to;* as 2 Chron. xxxii. 5. VAJANGAL NGAL HAMIGHDALOTH, *and raiſed* (the wall) *up to the towers:* not that it is credible, the wall exceeded the towers in height. Jer. iv. 18. NAGHANG NGAL LIBBECH, *it reacheth unto thine heart.* You may add other inſtances from Glaſſius.§ As therefore the uſe of this particle is very extenſive, we have no reaſon to reſtrain its ſignification to *owing* or *being due*, which ſeems leſs adapted to this place.

XV. I ſpeak not theſe things, with a view to detract any thing from the due praiſes of the very learned interpreter, to whom I even profeſs myſelf greatly indebted; but becauſe nothing is dearer to me, than to ſearch out the true meaning of the Spirit of God ſpeaking in the ſcriptures. While I am wholly intent upon this, I cannot avoid ſometimes examining the opinions of others;

* Sum. theol. c. iv. 1. † Chap. ii. 2. ‡ 2 Chron. xxx. 1.
§ Phil. ſacr. p. 773.

even of thoſe for whom I have the greateſt veneration. Faith is none of thoſe things, which may be impoſed by any human authority: neither is any injury done even to the greateſt of men, when we declare our diſſent in a modeſt manner. Whether we have done ſo here or not, muſt be left to the determination of the impartial reader; who may alſo judge, whether, by theſe obſervations, I deſerved ſo furious a ſhower of bluſtering language, as the very famous perſon Dr. John van der Waeyen has been pleaſed to pour down upon me in *Summa theol. Chriſt*, *lib.* i. *c.* 4. § 267. *& ſeq.* He very much complains, that I called that explication of the celebrated Cocceius *harſh* and *forced*, and that the words of the pſalm *were wreſted to that meaning*. This, I own, I had formerly wrote, out of my ſimplicity; nor did I imagine, there was either reproach or injury contained in theſe words. But there is no force of argument in the tartneſs of language. That not the leaſt appearance of that may remain, I now alter it, and inſtead of *wreſted*, ſay, *harſh*, *not running ſo ſmoothly*. The reſt I cancel, I freely forgive the ill language of my reprover, as becomes a Chriſtian. It does not belong to him, but to our common Lord, to paſs a judgment on my intention. As to the ſubject itſelf, I beſeech the reader, to compare my reaſonings with his; and if he thinks, that mine are ſolidly confuted, I am not againſt his differing, in every reſpect, from me. It appears otherwiſe to me: and the ſimple explication of the words, which I maintain, with the generality of expoſitors, began the more to pleaſe me, the more I ſaw my reprover ſtand in need, of ſuch a compaſs of words, and ſo far-fetched and intricate ſubtleties. I have no inclination minutely to conſider the reſt. Each one has his own temper, his own way of writing: which if I cannot commend, I en-

deavour to to bear with. But I return from this unwilling digreſſion.

XVI. As the doctrine of *the compact between the Father and the Son* is ſo often and ſo expreſsly delivered in ſcripture, that it is unjuſtly traduced as a new and late invention. Though I find few among the more ancient, who have profeſſedly handled this ſubject; yet I ſee ſome of the greateſt divines have ſometimes made mention of this compact. I ſay nothing now of Arminius, who does not carelesly diſcourſe of this compact, in his oration for the degree of Doctor; from which the very accurate Ameſius produces and commends ſome things. Ameſius himſelf charges a certain diſtinction of the Remonſtrants with this abſurdity, that "it denies, that the covenant entered into with Chriſt *(He ſhall ſee his ſeed, and the pleaſure of the Lord ſhall proſper in his hand)* had been ratified." Gomarus, treating of the baptiſm of Chriſt,* ſays, that it was the "ſign and ſeal of the covenant between God and Chriſt; namely, that God would be his God, and the beſtower of ſalvation; but he himſelf was bound to perform obedience from a principle of perpetual gratitude." In like manner, on the circumciſion of Chriſt,† he ſays, that it was "a ſign and ſeal of the covenant with God: which covenant conſiſted in this; partly that God was the God of Chriſt, according to the general promiſe, made alſo to him, Gen. xvii. 7. as to the ſeed of Abraham, Gal. iii. 16. and according to the ſingular character given of him, Pſal. xlv. 7. Heb. i. 9. partly, that Chriſt was bound to obey the will of God, John vi. 38. Matth. v. 17." See his *Diſp. de merito Chriſti*, § 1. The very learned Cloppenburg‡ not only mentions this ſubject, but fully and accurately handles it. The very famous Voeti-

* In Matth. iii. 13. † In Luke ii. 21. ‡ Diſput. iii. de fœdere Dei.

us* says, "He (Christ) was subject for us to a special law of paying our debt by a condign punishment, as our Mediator and Surety, according to the tenor of the covenant entered into with the Father." Essenius, formerly his scholar, and afterwards his colleague,† says, "The federal sealing of the divine promise did also really take place in Christ, according to Is. liii. 10. 11." Dr. Owen handles this very subject at large, on Heb. tom. ii. exercit. iv. p. 49. Nor was this doctrine unknown to the Popish doctors. Tirinus on Is. liii. 11. thus comments, that the prophet there explains "the compact agreed on between the Father and Christ," by which, on account of the sufferings and death of Christ, redemption, justification, and glorification are decreed to be the rewards of all those who faithfully adhere to Christ. Whence it appears, that these sentiments concerning *the compact between the Father and Son*, are not to be stigmatized with the brand of *singularity*.

* Disput. t. ii. p. 266. † De subjectione Christi ad legem, c. x. § 2.

CHAP. III.

The Nature of the Compact between the Father and the Son, more fully explained.

AS the compact between the Father and the Son is the foundation of the whole of our salvation, it will not be improper to stop here a little, and, in our further meditation, enquire, 1. From whence *the beginning* of this compact ought to be taken, and in *what periods* of time it was *completed*. 2. What *the law of the covenant* contains, *how far*, and *to what it binds the Son*. 3. Whether the Son could *not have engaged* in this *compact*,

or have *withdrawn himself from it*, and had no more to do with it. 4. What and how great *a reward* was promised to the Son, to be obtained in virtue of the compact.

II. I consider *three periods*, as it were, of this compact. Its *commencement* is to be sought in *the eternal counsel* of the adorable *Trinity:* in which *the Son* of God was constituted by *the Father*, with the approbation of *the Holy Spirit*, the Saviour of mankind; on this condition, that, in the fulness of time, he should be made of a woman, and made under the law; which *the Son undertook* to perform. Peter has a view to this, when he says,* that Christ *was foreordained before the foundation of the world.* To this purpose is also, what the Supreme Wisdom testifies concerning itself,† *I was set up* [anointed] *from everlasting;* that is, by my own, and the will of my Father, which is one and the same, I was appointed to the performance of the mediatorial office in time. Paul likewise declares, that *we were chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world.*‡ Consequently, Christ himself *was constituted from everlasting*, *the Head* of those that were to be saved, and *they were given unto him*,§ for whom he was to merit salvation, and in whom he was to be glorified and admired. From this constitution, the Son from everlasting bore a peculiar relation to those that were to be saved. Hence the book of life is by a special appropriation ascribed to *the Lamb*,‖ as containing a description of the peculiar people assigned to *the Lamb* from all eternity. Hence also it was, that God, in his amazing wisdom, so ordered many things in man's state of innocence, that the attentive remembrance of them after the fall, and the comparing them with those things which were afterwards re-

* 1 Pet. i. 20. † Prov. viii. 23. ‡ Eph. i. 4. § John xvii. 6. ‖ Rev. xiii. 8.

vealed, might have reminded man of this divine counsel; as we have shewn, above, book i. chap. vi. § 3.

III. The *second period* of this covenant I place in that *intercession* of Christ, by which, immediately upon the fall of man, he offered himself to God, now offended by sin, actually to perform those things, to which he had engaged himself from eternity; saying, Thou hast given them to me, I will make satisfaction for them: and so making way for the word of grace to be declared to, and the covenant of grace to be made with them. Thus Christ *was actually constituted Mediator*, and *declared* as such immediately after the fall; and *having undertaken the suretiship*, he began to *act* many things belonging to the offices of a Mediator. As a *Prophet*, and the interpreter of the divine will, he even then, by his Spirit, revealed those things which relate to the salvation of the elect, and by his ministers published them.* Nay, he himself sometimes appeared in the character of an *Angel*, instructing his people in the counsel of God. As a *King*, he gathered his church, and formed to himself a people, in whom he might reign by his word and Spirit. For it was *the Son* of God, who said to Israel, Exod. xix. 6. *Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests*, and who, with more than *royal pomp*, published his law on mount *Sinai*,† and whom *Isaiah* saw sitting as *king upon a throne*.‡ As a *Priest*, he took upon himself the sins of the elect, *to be expiated by the sacrifice* of his body, which was to be fitted for him in the fulness of time. In virtue of this, as being a faithful Surety, he likewise *interceded* for the elect, by declaring his will, that they might be taken into favour, saying, *Deliver them from going down to the pit, I have found* LUTRON, *a ransom*.§ For what *angel* could speak thus, but *the Angel*

* Is. xlviii. 15. 1 Pet. i. 11. and iii. 19. † Acts vii. 38.
‡ Chap. vi. compared with John xii. 41. § Job xxxiii. 24.

of the covenant? who even then was called *an angel*, before his coming in the flesh, because he was accomplishing what depended upon that future mission. He is *one of a thousand*, the Captain of the host of angels, that guards each believer, *the chiefest of* [the standard-bearer above] *ten thousand.** In like manner, the archangel Michael (and who is this but the Lord Jesus Christ?) is called ACHAD HASSARIM HARISHONIM, *one of the chief princes*,† that is, the unparallelled among the chiefs, because he is HASAR HAGGADOL, *that great prince.*‡ It is he *who declares to man his righteousness*, *both the righteousness of God* and *of man.* It is he who is COPHÆR the *propitiation*, *whom God hath set forth as* HILASTERION, *a propitiation.*§ See also Zech. i. 12, 13.

IV. The *third period* of this compact is that, when, on his *assuming human nature*, he suffered *his ears to be bored*;‖ that is, engaged himself as a voluntary servant to God, from love to his Lord the Father, and to his spouse the church, and his spiritual children (for the ears of such voluntary servants were bored;¶ GENOMENOS HUPO NOMON, *was made under the law*,** *subjecting himself to the law:* which he solemnly testified by his *circumcision*, on the eighth day after his birth, whereby he made himself *a debtor to do the whole law.*††

V. *The law* proposed to *the Mediator*, may be considered in a twofold view: 1. As *the directory of his nature* and *office*. 2. As *the condition of the covenant*. *The Mediator* himself may be considered these three ways. 1. As *God*. 2. As *Man*. 3. As *Mediator God-man*. We are distinctly to compare these things together.

* Cant. v. 10. † Dan. x. 13. ‡ Dan. xii. 1. § Rom. iii. 25. ‖ Compare Psal. xl. 7. with Heb. x. 5. ¶ Exod. xxi. 5, 6. ** Gal. iv. 4. †† Gal. iii. 3.

VI. *The Son*, as preciſely God, neither was, nor could be *ſubject* to *any law*, to any ſuperior: that being contrary to the nature of the Godhead, which we now ſuppoſe the Son to have in common with the Father, *who thought it no robbery* TO EINAI ISA THEO, *to be equal with God.* No ſubjection, nothing but the higheſt ſupereminence is competent to the Deity, nor can it otherwiſe be conceived. In this reſpect he is *King of kings, and Lord of lords.** The Emperors Gratian, Valentine, and Theodoſius, ſaid long ago, that "he is a true Chriſtian, who believes, that the Deity of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is one in equal power; that UNDER THE SAME MAJESTY THERE IS ONE DEITY; and he who teaches the contrary, is a heretic."†

VII. Nor is it any objection againſt this, that the Son, from *eternity*, *undertook* for men, and thereby came under a certain peculiar relation to thoſe that were to be ſaved. For that engagement, as it was nothing but the moſt glorious act of the divine will of the Son, doing what none but God could do, implies therefore no manner of ſubjection: it only imports, that there ſhould be a time, when that divine perſon, on aſſuming fleſh, would appear in the form of a ſervant. And by undertaking to perform this obedience, in the human nature, in its proper time, *the Son, as God*, did no more ſubject himſelf to *the Father*, than the Father ſubjected himſelf to *the Son*, to the owing that reward of debt, which he promiſed him a right to claim. All theſe things are to be conceived of in a manner becoming God.

VIII. Nor ought it to be urged, that *the Son*, even before *his incarnation*, was called MALACH *the Angel.*‡ For that ſignifies no inferiority of the Son, before the time appointed for his incarnation; but only a form re-

* 1 Tim. vi. 15. † Cod. lib. 1. tit. 1. ‡ Gen. xlviii. 16. Exod. xxiii. 20.

ſembling the appearances of angels, prefiguring his future miſſion into the world.

IX. As *man*, he was doubtleſs ſubject to the *moral* law, as it is the *rule* both of *the nature* and *actions* of man. For it is a contradiction, as we proved before, to ſuppoſe a rational creature, ſuch as is the human nature of Chriſt, to be without law. And in this manner he was really bound by the law: 1. To preſerve *the holineſs implanted into his nature* from his firſt conception, *unſpotted*. 2. To expreſs it in the moſt perfect manner, in *his life* and all his *actions*, with all his heart, all his ſoul, and all his ſtrength. 3. *Conſtantly to perſevere* therein, without yielding to any temptations, to *the end* of his courſe.

X. And as Chriſt was not only a *man*, and a common inhabitant of the world, but alſo an *Iſraelite*, that is, *a member of the church of the Old Teſtament*, and *a citizen of the commonwealth of Iſrael*; he was alſo ſubject to the ceremonial and political laws, which were then ſtill in force, according to the divine inſtitution. By virtue of theſe laws, Chriſt made uſe of *the ſacraments of the Old Teſtament*, obſerved *the feſtivals*, repaired to *the temple*, and behaved as an obedient *ſubject* under a lawful *magiſtracy*. He initiated himſelf by *circumciſion* to the obedience of the *ceremonial* law: declared his obedience to *the political* laws by paying tribute.*

XI. It may be objected, that as to ceremonial obſervances, Chriſt declared himſelf *greater than the temple*,† and *Lord of the ſabbath*;‡ as to the political, that *being the Son of God*, he was exempted from paying tribute.§ But this may be ſolved from the different relations which Chriſt ſuſtained. Certainly as *God*, and *the Son* of

* Matth. xvii. 24, 25. † Matth. xii. 6. ‡ Ver. 8. § Matth. xvii. 26, 27.

God, he was *Lord of the law*, *the Lawgiver* himſelf, who, on account of his divine nature, had authority to diſpenſe with precepts of a mutable and poſitive inſtitution: and if, when he became man, he had inſiſted on his being *the Son of God*, and for that reaſon had acted as equal to God, in that reſpect neither the officers of the temple, nor the queſtors of the Emperor could have demanded any thing of him as an inferior. But Chriſt did not think proper to inſiſt on this his right; but rather to behave as *a ſervant of rulers*.*

XII. But further, as *Mediator* and *Surety*, he is under the law in another manner, and that two ways. 1. As *injoining the condition* of perfect obedience, upon which he and his, were to partake of happineſs. 2. As *binding* to the penalty due to the ſins of the elect, which he had taken upon himſelf.

XIII. As to the former: Had the Son of God been pleaſed to appear in our nature, but not in the quality of *a Surety*, he would neceſſarily have been a holy perſon, and conformed to the law of God, preſcribed to the human nature. For every man, as ſuch, is bound to be ſubject to God, in all righteouſneſs and holineſs, which is exactly deſcribed in the divine law. But by the *perſonal covenant-engagement* of the Mediator, to that abſolute ſubjection of nature, which is eternally to continue without end, there is added another obligation to ſubjection, limited to a certain period of time, which the apoſtle† calls *the days of his fleſh*; during which, Chriſt, obeying the law, was not in the ſtate of poſſeſſing, but meriting happineſs; conſidering this law, not only as *a rule of life*, but alſo as *preſcribing the condition* of acquiring happineſs. For, if we ſeclude the

* Iſ. xlix. 7. † Heb. v. 7.

procuring of our salvation, nothing hindered him from the possession of glory and happiness, from the very beginning of his conception. As he was the Son, he was actually heir of all things. But it was owing to his voluntary covenant-engagement, that *though he was rich*,* and might have acted as equal to God, from the very beginning of his assuming humanity, *yet for our sakes he became poor*. That this subjection to the law, as *enjoining the condition of happiness*, is to be distinguished from that other absolute subjection to it, as *the rule of holiness*, appears hence, that Christ has now laid aside the first, while this last continues, and will continue to eternity.

XIV. The usefulness of this distinction is considerable, in order to the solving that *problem*, *how the active obedience of Christ*, so called, though not so properly, *may be imputed to us*, *seeing as man he owed it for himself*. For, besides that on *our* account he was *made man*, it was not barely from his being man, that he was under the necessity of meriting eternal life by the legal covenant: nay, and considered as God-man, abstracted from his suretiship-engagement, he might have exempted himself from all indigence, and all necessity of meriting; and consequently might have gloriously exercised all power in heaven and in earth, in and by the human nature, from the *first* moment of his incarnation: for this flows from the union of the humanity with the person of the Son of God. But his subjecting himself to the law, as prescribing the condition of happiness, is wholly from his voluntary covenant-engagement, undertaken on our account; which, by every right or just title, may and ought to be imputed to us. The very ingenious and judicious divine, Francis Gomarus, seems to have had

* 2 Cor. viii. 9.

this in his view, when he thus comments on Phil. ii. 9. "For our ſake, he alſo veiled his glory for a time, which he might juſtly have enjoyed, and ſubmitted to the curſed death of the croſs; which, if we conſider his merit and power, he might have declined."

XV. Beſides, the Son of God was, in virtue of the compact, *ſubject to the curſe of the law, being made a curſe for us.** For as the law likewiſe exacted *puniſhment* from the tranſgreſſor, and Chriſt bound himſelf, by his engagement to fulfil the whole law; it was neceſſary, that *he ſhould come in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh, to condemn ſin in the fleſh.*† Which likeneſs of ſinful fleſh conſiſts in this, that Chriſt being, from his very birth, obnoxious to various miſeries, both of ſoul and body, at laſt he concluded the courſe of his painful life by that death, in which the moſt ſtriking ſigns of every kind of curſe appeared: for it was juſt that the ſinner ſhould thus live and die. Now Chriſt, conſidered ſimply as *a righteous perſon*, might have been exempted from theſe miſeries, and from ſuch a death. But after he had once, by *a voluntary engagement*, ſubmitted himſelf to the law for us, he became bound to ſatisfy alſo this ſanction of the law, which threatened death to ſinners. As all theſe things ariſe from the mediatorial *covenant*, they belong to Chriſt *as Mediator.*

XVI. But ſince in Chriſt, as *Mediator*, there is an union of the *divine* and *human* natures, this difficulty remains to be diſcuſſed, whether *both* natures were in ſome meaſure ſubject to the law. Nothing forbids us to affirm this of *the human*, as we have already ſo often ſhewn; but it ſeems, from what we have confirmed, § 6. it muſt be denied with reſpect to *the divine.* But as the human nature does not, without the divine, complete the

* Gal. iii. 16. † Rom. viii. 3.

perſon of the Mediator, the Mediator, as ſuch, does not ſeem to have undertaken ſubjection to the law, without bringing his divine nature likewiſe to ſhare therein.

XVII. In order to remove this difficulty, we are accurately to diſtinguiſh between *both natures* conſidered *ſeparately*, and the *perſon of God-man*, conſiſting of *both natures united*. It was proper, that both natures ſhould act ſuitably to themſelves and their diſtinct properties. *The divine nature*, as characterized in the Son, ſince it could not *truly* and *really be ſubject*, did *not*, by virtue of the covenant, *exert* or diſplay all its majeſty, in the aſſumed form of a ſervant; nor hinder that nature, to which it was united by the hypoſtatical union, from being truly ſubject to the law, both as to the condition of the reward, and as to the penal ſanction; which indeed was neither a real *renunciation*, nor *degradation* of the divine ſuperiority, but only a certain *œconomical veiling* of it for a time.

XVIII. *The human nature* was *really* and *properly* ſubject to the law: nay, from *the hypoſtatical union* there was ſuperadded a certain *peculiar obligation* upon the human nature of Chriſt, conſidered in *relation* to *the ſuretiſhip* to be undertaken for us as his brethren. For as men are bound to love God in ſuch a manner as above all things to ſeek his glory, which ſhines moſt illuſtriouſly in the juſtification and ſanctification of the ſinner; and ſo to love their neighbour, as to deſire to deliver their brother from ſin and miſery, even at their own peril, if poſſible: but no mere man can effect this; yet the man Chriſt, who is likewiſe true God, and therefore is able, by his obedience and ſuffering, to promote this glory of God, and the ſalvation of his brethren, was by that very thing obliged to undertake and undergo all thoſe things, in which he might ſhew forth this moſt in-

tenſe love of God and his neighbour. Since he only of all men could do this, he only of all was bound to do it. What others were obliged to will *conditionally*, as we obſerve a ſpark of this love in Moſes,* and in Paul,† was incumbent on the man Chriſt *abſolutely;* becauſe, being *God-man*, he could abſolutely perform it.

XIX. We commonly aſcribe to *the perſon God-man*, the relation of an inferior to a ſuperior, by a conſtitution, or appointment; ſo that, both by doing and ſuffering, thoſe things might be accompliſhed, according to the condition of each nature, which were requiſite to our ſalvation: ſo that the very obedience and ſufferings themſelves, are not only to be appropriated to the human nature, but to be conſidered as truly performed and ſuffered by the God-man. If this was not the caſe, they would not be of infinite value and dignity, nor ſufficient for our redemption. Hence, *he who is in the form of God*, is ſaid to *have made himſelf of no reputation* [emptied himſelf] *and become obedient unto death;*‡ and *to be the Lord of glory who was crucified.*§

XX. It is uſual here to inquire, *whether Chriſt, as Mediator, is inferior to the Father and ſubordinate to him?* But this controverſy, it ſeems, *may* be eaſily ſettled among the orthodox. If the Mediator be conſidered in *the ſtate of humiliation*, and the form of a ſervant, he is certainly inferior to the Father, and ſubordinate to him. It was not of his human nature only, but of himſelf in that ſtate, that he himſelf ſaid,‖ *The Father is greater than I.* Nay, the very *mediatorial office* in itſelf, may be reckoned to import a certain *œconomical inferiority* or ſubordination; as being to be laid down, when all things ſhall be perfectly finiſhed, and *God himſelf ſhall become all in all.* Yet ſo that this un-

* Exod. xxx. 32. † Rom. ix. 3. ‡ Phil. ii. 6, 7, 8.
§ 1 Cor. ii. 8. ‖ John xiv. 28.

dertaking and mediation, and the bringing of fallen man to God, to grace and glory, is not so much beneath the excellency of the Deity, but we, without the least hesitation, affirm, that this glory of mediation is incommunicable to any creature. It is the glory of JEHOVAH to be the righteousness of Israel. This glory he gives to none who is not God. To be Mediator does not merely denote a servant of God, but the great God and Saviour; who, as the first and principal cause of saving grace, equal to the Father, works, by his own power, our reconciliation with God, by means of the subjection and obedience of his human nature, without which the co-equal Son could neither perform his service, nor obey the Father.

XXI. The third thing we promised to inquire into, was this: *Could the Son refuse to undertake, or withdraw himself from this compact?* To which question we are again to answer distinctly. 1. If *the Son* be considered as *God*, the whole of this covenant was of his own most free will and pleasure. There neither was, nor could be any necessity, to bind the Son of God, as such to this covenant. Here is nothing but mere *good pleasure*, *philanthropy* unmeritted, and altogether liberal, pure, and unmixed grace. 2. If he be considered as *man*, he indeed entered into this engagement freely and spontaneously, without being constrained; yet he could not, without sin, from which he is at the greatest distance, withdraw from this agreement. Which we prove in the following manner.

XXII. 1. The human nature of Christ, as we have often said, could not be without law. The law under which it naturally is, is *the royal law of love*. Which does not indeed *formally*, as it was made for man in innocence, but yet *eminently* contain this precept, which

John inculcates,* *That one lay down his life for the brethren.* I say, the law of love, as given to man in innocence, contains not this precept *formally;* because death is inconsistent with such a state, and perfect obedience, which is all summed up in love, frees man from all necessity of dying, according to the promise, *He who doth those things, shall live in them.* And therefore we have shewn, that if Christ be considered *in himself as a holy person,* without *respect* to *the decree* of God, and his own engagement for his miserable brethren, he was, by virtue of his perfect holiness, under no necessity of dying and suffering. But the law of love does, supposing the requisite circumstances, *eminently* contain the command of dying for our brethren. For it enjoins us to *love God above all, and our neighbour as ourselves.* And he who *loves God above all,* does not only delight in God his *Creator, Benefactor, Lord,* and *Example;* not only studies to do every thing agreeable to him, but endeavours to direct and to promote all things that are God's to his glory. And as he ought to esteem *the glory of God* dear above *his own advantages,* he also ought to be ready to undergo every thing, by which the glory of God may be most illustrated. And supposing such a one to have brethren in distress, from which he can deliver them by his death, so that God shall, in an eminent manner, appear glorious in them; *the love of our brethren,* together with the love of God, enjoins him not to decline dying for them; especially, if he himself, becoming a conqueror over death, shall thereby obtain a most distinguishing reward at last. Since therefore Christ, as man, could not but be under the law of love; and a holy man, as doubtless it became him to be, cannot be conceived as destitute of love, much less as having a contra-

* 1 ep. iii. 16.

ry diſpoſition; it follows, that he could not, in ſuch circumſtances, withdraw himſelf from his agreement to ſatisfy for men; becauſe the law of love *eminently* contains ſuch an obligation.

XXIII. 2. The Son of God had from eternity engaged to ſatisfy this compact, by aſſuming human nature, and obeying in it, as we ſhewed above, § 2. If the human nature, perſonally united to him, could have withdrawn itſelf from, and renounced the compact, it was poſſible that the Son of God himſelf might have violated his plighted faith. For, in that caſe, Chriſt would not have been either the true and faithful God, who cannot lie, or not be God omnipotent, as who being willing from eternity to take that province upon himſelf, could not, in time, induce the human nature to execute that, for which it was aſſumed at firſt. Nor do I ſee what reply can be made to this argument, unleſs one ſhall venture to ſay, that it is contrary to the nature of liberty, that the will ſhould be thus bent by a ſuperior cauſe: and that, in ſuch a caſe, the human nature, declining to ſtand to that compact, would be deprived of the honor of the hypoſtatical union, and another be aſſumed in its ſtead. But beſides that this overthrows the inſeparability of the hypoſtatical union, admitted on both ſides, the ſame difficulty recurs with reſpect to the nature newly aſſumed; becauſe equal liberty is to be aſcribed to it.

XXIV. 3. God had, by an eternal and irrevocable decree, appointed, *promiſed*, and *confirmed by oath*, the inheritance of all bleſſings in Chriſt.* But ſuppoſing Chriſt could have withdrawn himſelf from the compact, then *the decree* of God might be rendered *void*, his *promiſe be deceitful*, and his *oath falſified*, and conſe-

* Heb. vi. 13.—18. Luke i. 73.

quently the whole counſel of God concerning the œconomy of our ſalvation, ſo often inculcated in the prophetical writings, become of no effect: which is indeed blaſphemy to imagine. There is no occaſion to ſuggeſt, as one has done, that God could, without the payment of any price, have remitted the debt of ſin, and among ſome thouſand methods have found out another way of ſaving mankind, ſeeing this method had failed of its end. For as this is very much more than we can readily yield to, ſo it is nothing to the purpoſe. For God did not only, in general, appoint, promiſe, and ſwear to give ſalvation to his elect; but ſalvation to be obtained by Chriſt and his obedience; which decree, promiſe, and oath, could be accompliſhed no other way. Not to ſay, how unworthy it is of God, to be obliged to make new decrees, after the former had not reached the deſired iſſue. Which is the very bane of the Remonſtrant divinity.

XXV. 4. Let us ſuppoſe, that the human nature of Chriſt, to ſpeak plainly, could have withdrawn itſelf from this compact; yet *it could not* do it at leaſt *without* a horrible *ſin*, after the preordination of God, the eternal will of the Son, and the promiſe and oath had been diſcovered to him. Nay, it had been a more dreadful ſin than that of the firſt Adam, for him obſtinately to oppoſe all theſe conſiderations, and prefer his own private advantage to the glory of God and ſalvation of the elect. And by this means we ſhould be reduced, by this hypotheſis, we are now contending againſt, to the ſhocking blaſphemies of ſome ſchoolmen, who affirm, that "Chriſt could have ſinned, and conſequently have been damned." Theſe are the depths of Satan, which all Chriſtians ought to pronounce accurſed.

XXVI. Hence we see what we are to think of the divinity of the Remonstrants on this head, who, in chap. xvii. p. 187. *b.* of their *apology* or remonstrance, say, that "the obedience of Christ was of a different nature from ours; but agreeing in this, that it was altogether free. Christ obeyed the will of his Father, not as we obey the law of God under the threatening of eternal death, in case of disobedience: God forbid; but as an ambassador is said to obey his soverign, or a beloved son his father, when his sovereign or father confers on either an honorable office to be executed by them, adding the promise of some extraordinary reward, if they will freely and on their account undertake it. Whoever obeys in this manner, that is, willingly takes that office upon himself, he, indeed, properly and freely obeys; not that he would properly sin, did he not undertake it; or when undertaken, lay it down again, with the goodwill of the father; much less that he would deserve eternal punishment, if he did not undertake it, or excuse himself from undertaking or bearing the burden thereof; as it is most certain, that when we disobey God and his law, we deserve punishment. But no such threatening of punishment was made to Christ; but he could either not undertake it, or when he undertook it, resign his charge, and so not enjoy or forfeit the promised reward."

XXVII. In this discourse there are as many faults, as sentences. We will now remark these principal ones. 1. The leading error of the Remonstrants, from whence their other errors flow, is this, that the liberty of the will consists in *indifference*, so as one may, or may not obey; whereas it is to be placed in *the free good pleasure of the mind.* Unless one would affirm either of these things, that either the holy angels, and the spirits of just men made perfect, nay, Christ himself exalted, could

not do the will of God, or not do it freely. 2. They diſtinguiſh not *the perſon* of the Son of God, and *the grace*, by which he humbled himſelf to undertake obedience in the human nature to be aſſumed, from *the human nature* itſelf, and *obedience* of Chriſt, now in his ſtate of *humiliation*. The grace of the Son of God was ſo free, that he could not be againſt this humiliation, or emptying of himſelf, that he might come under an obligation to obedience. There is no reaſon, but the moſt free good pleaſure of the divine will, why this future humiliation was decreed by the adorable Trinity, and conſequently by the Son himſelf. Yet, ſuppoſing this free decree, the human nature aſſumed by *the Logos* for this purpoſe, could not decline, or draw back from the office aſſigned to Chriſt, and now undertaken by the *Logos* himſelf, without ſin and diſobedience. 3. They do not conſider, that *the human nature* of Chriſt was bound by *an indiſpenſable neceſſity*, to *the holineſs* of the image of God: ſince they compare the whole of Chriſt's obedience with *the undertaking of ſome office, which a ſovereign confers on his ambaſſador, or a father on his ſon*. For as an ambaſſador, in the quality of *a ſubject*, and a ſon, as ſuch, are bound by *the law of nature* itſelf, to perform to a ſovereign and a father, an obedience diſtinct from that, which ariſes from their *willingly undertaking this honorary office:* ſo in like manner the human nature of Chriſt was, and ſtill continues to be, bound to perform obedience to God, in order to maintain this conformity with the holineſs of God; which obligation is diſtinct from his undertaking the mediatorial office. 4. They falſely place *the eſſential difference* between *the obedience of Chriſt* and *ours* in this, that we obey *under the threatening of eternal death:* but Chriſt not ſo. For that threatening does not properly belong to obedience, which really ought not to be ex-

torted from us by the fear of punishment, but to proceed freely from a reverence to the divine command, and a love to holiness. Our obedience will be no less obedience in heaven, when the threatening of eternal death shall no longer have any place. Add, that the same law, which is proposed to us, was also the rule of the life and actions of Christ. But that law had the sanction of eternal death, which it was incumbent on Christ to believe to be just and right; tending to inform the conscience of God's hatred to sin, and to inflame it likewise with a hatred of sin and unrighteousness. And thus far, after Christ had humbled himself for us, he obeyed the law even under the threatening, and acknowledged the same to be just; and that very threatening of the law produced in Christ a sense of the wrath of God, when he suffered for us. 5. They absurdly pretend, that Christ could, *with the Father's consent, decline the office committed to him*, or *resign it, after he had undertaken it*: as if one should say, that a son could have the consent of a virtuous father, to make him a liar and guilty of perjury. For God the Father had promised, and solemnly confirmed by oath, that he would procure our salvation by the Son. 6. It is no less absurd, that they perceive no inconvenience flowing from the non-susception, or from the resignation of that office, but this one, that, in that case, Christ *would not enjoy, or would forfeit the promised reward*; since the very salvation of all the elect, and, which is the greatest of all, the whole of the glory of God, would thence fall to the ground. I would also fain know, what reward Christ would, according to that hypothesis, have forfeited; whether the honor of the hypostatical union, or eternal salvation itself, and the communion of the divine love and glory; or whether that sublime glory, in which he is now eminently placed above the rest of the creatures:

alſo, whether it is not blaſphemy to ſay, that either the hypoſtatical union is diſſolved, or that any nature hypoſtatically united to the Son of God, can have no ſhare in eternal ſalvation; or, if in a ſtate of happineſs, he has not *a more excellent name* than the reſt of the creatures: in like manner, whether the loſs of ſo great a happineſs can, in an intelligent nature, be without an eternal ſenſation of the moſt bitter anguiſh: in fine, whether it is not much better, and more worthy of God and his Chriſt, to believe, that Chriſt could not but undertake the office laid upon him by the Father, and never withdraw from it, than run headlong into ſuch abſurdities.

XXVIII. We ſhall briefly diſpatch the fourth thing remaining; namely, *the reward which the Son was to obtain, in virtue of this compact*, by inquiring, *firſt, what reward* was promiſed the Son: *and then, what relation his obedience* had to this *reward.*

XXIX. The reward promiſed to the Son, is *the higheſt degree of glory*:* *Father, glorify thy Son, that thy Son alſo may glorify thee.* Now, this glory may be conſidered diſtinctly with reſpect to *the humanity*, to *the Deity*, and to *the whole perſon.* In the humanity, I obſerve theſe *three* degrees of glory. 1. That, together with the elect, *his fellows*,† and *co-heirs*,‡ it is bleſſed in the perfect fruition of God. 2. That it is exalted above all creatures, on account of the dignity of the hypoſtatical union. 3. That the glory of the Godhead ſhines forth therein, with a more illuſtrious refulgence, than in the days of the fleſh: ſo that the man Chriſt cannot be ſeen, but he muſt appear to be the glorious Son of God, and his glory be, as *the glory of the only begotten of the Father.*§

* John xvii. 1. † Pſal. xlv. 7. ‡ Rom. viii. 17. § John i. 14.

XXX. *The Deity* of the Son could properly acquire no new increaſe of glory, as it could not properly be humbled. For as *the humiliation* of Chriſt, with reſpect to his Godhead, conſiſted in this, that under the human form of a ſervant, which he aſſumed, he covered the brightneſs of his glory as with a veil: ſo *the glorification of the Deity* conſiſts in this, that all the magnificence of the glorious majeſty of God beautifully diſcovers itſelf, and becomes more conſpicuous. And this is what Chriſt prayed for.* *And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own ſelf, with the glory which I had with thee, before the world was.*

XXXI. *The whole perſon of the Mediator* obtains this reward. 1. That *God hath* HUPERUPSOSE, over raiſed, *highly exalted him, and given him a name, which is above every name.*† *Far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but alſo in that which is to come.*‡ 2. That the whole church is given him as his peculiar poſſeſſion,§ and he himſelf is given *as head over all things to the church,*‖ and *all power is given him in heaven and in earth,*¶ that he may govern all things, for the benefit of the church. 3. That, on account of the moſt intimate union of the church, as his myſtical body, with himſelf, he receives all thoſe gifts, which on the account of his merit are beſtowed on the elect. For the church united to Chriſt, the body together with the head, is called Chriſt.** And thus literally run the words, Pſal. lxviii. 18. LAKACHTA MATTANOTH BAADAM, *Thou haſt received gifts in men*, as the Septuagint alſo renders them, ELABES DOMATA EN ANTHROPOIS. Inſtead of which the apoſtle, Eph. iv. 8. not tranſlating literally, but giving the ſenſe of the

* John xvii. 5. † Phil. ii. 9. ‡ Eph. i. 21. § Pſal. ii. 8. Iſ. liii. 10. ‖ Eph. i. 22. ¶ Matth. xxvii. 18. ** 1 Cor. xii. 12.

words, says, EDOKE DOMATA TOIS ANTHROPOIS, *he gave gifts to men.* For as Christ is supposed to receive them, when they were given to his members, so he gives his members what he received of the Father. *Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.**

XXXII. *The obedience* of Christ bears to these *blessings*, not only the relation of *antecedent* to *consequent*, but of *merit* to *reward:* so that the obedience of Christ is *the cause* and *the condition* now fulfilled, by virtue of which he has *a right* to the reward. This several express passages of scripture declare. *Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest wickedness,*† (in these words the obedience of Christ is described) NGAL KEN *therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.* These words contain the reward, intimating the most joyful entrance of Christ into the kingdom of his glorious delight. The relation of obedience to the reward is set forth by the word, *therefore*, which denotes the cause, and not a mere antecedent. In like manner,‡ LACHEN, therefore *will I divide him a portion with the great*, and *he shall divide the spoil with the strong*, TACHATH ASHER because *he hath poured out his soul unto death.* Where the relative particles, ASHER TACHATH, and LACHEN, expressly indicate that commutative justice, whereby the reward due bears a reciprocal relation to the obedience performed. *He became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross:* DIO KAI HO THEOS AUTON UPERUPSOSE, *wherefore God also hath highly exalted him.*§ ANTI TES PROKEIMENES AUTO CHARAS HUPEMEINE STAURON, *who, for the*

* Acts ii. 33. † Psal. xlv. 7. ‡ Is. liii. 12. § Phil. i. 8, 9.

*joy that was ſet before him, endured the croſs.** Where there is an expreſs interchange of obedience and reward.

XXXIII. And the thing ſpeaks for itſelf. For as this covenant between the Father and the Son is, *When thou ſhalt make his ſoul* [if the ſoul of the Son ſhall devote himſelf] *an offering for ſin, he ſhall ſee his ſeed*, Iſ. liii. 10. upon performing the condition, the Son acquired a right to the reward, and ſo has a *merit* by *compact*. Nay, as this obedience is not that of a mere man, but of Chriſt God-man, an infinite perſon, it is alſo of an infinite value, conſequently bears the juſteſt proportion to the greateſt correſponding glory; and thus far it is *a merit of condignity*, as it is called; ſuch as falls to no mere creature.

XXXIV. The paſſages of ſcripture, which repreſent the humiliation of Chriſt, as *the antecedent* to the ſubſequent glory, are not contrary to this doctrine. For every cauſe is an antecedent, though every antecedent is not a cauſe. And the merit of Chriſt *for himſelf* is ſo far from being prejudicial to his merit *for us*, that, on the contrary, they are inſeparably conjoined. For if he merited for *himſelf*, in order to be the head of the elect in glory, and to receive gifts for them, he certainly, at the ſame time, merited for *the elect*, in order to their being glorified, and enriched with gifts, becoming the myſtical body of Chriſt. Neither by this doctrine is the excellency of the love of Chriſt towards us diminiſhed, though in his ſtate of humiliation he had likewiſe an eye to his own exaltation. For he might have been glorious as to himſelf, without going to it by this way of death, and the pains of hell. Beſides, he looked upon his own glory, as the beginning and cauſe of ours, and whoſe fruit was all to redound to us. And

* Heb. xii. 2.

it was the higheſt pitch of love, that he would not be glorious without us. Nor ſhould the word CHARIZESTHAI, *given*, which the apoſtle uſes, Phil. ii. 9. be urged too cloſely, as if the rewards there mentioned were of mere grace, freely given to Chriſt, without any regard to his obedience, as the cauſe of his right or title to them. For Paul there expreſsly aſſerts, that they were given to Chriſt on account of his obedience. Nor does that term always denote mere grace. Heſychius, that very excellent maſter of Greek, explains it by DRANTA KECHARISMENA, *to do what is acceptable.* But thoſe things alſo are called acceptable, which are due: the Greeks ſay, THEOIS KECHARISMENA POIEIN, *to do what is acceptable to the gods.* Whence the ſame thing, which here, in reſpect to Chriſt, is called UPHENGULLATHI, *the price of his labour, the reward of his work*, adjudged to him by the juſt judgment of God. *For my judgment is with the Lord, and the reward of my work with my God.* So that the plain meaning of this paſſage in Paul is this; becauſe Chriſt ſubmitted himſelf to the Father by ſo free or voluntary an obedience, the Father therefore alſo hath done acceptable things in him, by giving him a name above every name.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Perſon of the Surety.

HAVING, not without ſome degree of care, explained the nature of the covenant between the Father and the Son, it is fit we treat a little more diſtinctly of *the Surety* himſelf, concerning whom theſe are the prin-

cipal particulars; and *firſt*, let us conſider *the* PERSON *of the* SURETY, and what is requiſite to conſtitute ſuch: and then that SATISFACTION, which he undertook to make by his ſuretiſhip; the TRUTH, NECESSITY, EFFECTS, and EXTENT of which we ſhall diſtinctly deduce from the ſacred writings.

II. Theſe *four* things are required, as neceſſary to *the* PERSON *of a* SURETY, that he might be capable to engage for us. 1. That he be *true man*, conſiſting of a human ſoul and body. 2. That he be *a righteous* and *holy man*, without any ſpot of ſin. 3. That he be *true and eternal* GOD. 4. That he be all this in the *unity of perſon*. Of each ſeverally and in order.

III. That our Surety ought to be *true man*, is what Paul declares more than once.* EPREPE, *it became him*, it behoved him, it was becoming God, *that he who ſanctifieth, and they who are ſanctified, be all of one*, of one human ſeed, ſo that they might call each other brethren. *In all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren*, in order to be their *Goel* or Kinſman-Redeemer: *for verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the ſeed of Abraham* [did not take upon him to deliver angels, but to deliver the ſeed of Abraham.]

IV. This aſſumption does not ſeem to me to denote the aſſuming human nature into perſonal union, but the aſſuming of the elect in order to their deliverance. For, 1. The cauſal conjunction *for* indicates, that the Apoſtle uſes this middle term to prove, what he had ſaid, ver. 14. about the partaking of fleſh and blood, and which, ver. 17. he deduces by the illative particle *wherefore*. But the middle term muſt be diſtinguiſhed from the concluſion: and ſo there is no tautology is the apoſtle's ve-

* Heb. ii. 10, 11, 16, 17.

ry juſt inference. 2. Since the aſſumption of the human nature was long before the apoſtle wrote thoſe things, he would not ſpeak of it in the preſent tenſe, as he does here, but in the preterite, as he did ver. 14. 3. As it would be an uncouth expreſſion to ſay, The Son of God aſſumed or took man, if we ſuppoſe he only meant, that the Son of God aſſumed human nature; and in like manner this other expreſſion would appear harſh, The Son of God did not aſſume angels, to denote that he did not aſſume the nature of angels. 4. In the ſcripture-ſtyle EPILAMBANESTHAI ſignifies to deliver, by laying hold of one; thus Matth. xiv. 31. *And immediately Jeſus ſtretched forth his hand, and* EPELABETO AUTOU, *caught him:* and this ſignification is moſt appoſite to the context. For, in the preceding verſe, the apoſtle had ſaid, that Chriſt *delivered them, who through fear of death were all their life-time ſubject to bondage*, alluding, it ſeems, to the bondage of *Egypt*. But God is repreſented to us in ſcripture, as, with a ſtretched-out hand, laying hold on and bringing his people out of *Egypt; In the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.** Which the apoſtle thus expreſſes in Greek, EPILABOMENOU TES CHEIROS AUTON, EXAGAGEIN AUTOUS EK GES AIGUPTOU, *in the day when I took them by the hand, to lead them out of the land of Egypt:* where we have the ſame word EPILAMBANESTHAI. And in profane authors, it denotes *to claim* ſomething as one's property, and ſay, according to Virgil, *Theſe are mine.* Thus Plato,† HOTI AN TIS KEKTEMENOS E KAI MEDEIS EPILABETAI, "if one is in poſſeſſion of any thing, and none claims it as his own." To this anſwers the Hebrew GAAL. Theſe things make me, with many very learn-

* Jer. xxxi. 32. † xii. de legibus.

ed men, think, that theſe words of the apoſtle, whoſe genuine ſenſe we have been enquiring into, rather contain an argument for the incarnation of Chriſt, than aſſert the incarnation itſelf.

V. Moreover, it may be proved by invincible arguments, that it was neceſſary our Surety ſhould be man. Let us pauſe a little here, and ſee, whether we may not poſſibly ſearch this truth to the bottom. The legal covenant, entered into with the firſt man, is founded on the very nature of God; at leaſt with reſpect to the commands of the covenant, and the threatenings annexed to them: ſo that it would be a contradiction, if theſe precepts of the law of nature ſhould not be propoſed to man, or if man, after the violation of them, ſhould be ſaved without a ſatisfaction; which I now preſuppoſe, as having proved it before, and ſhall further confirm it in the ſequel. I therefore proceed: This ſatisfaction can be nothing elſe, but the performing the ſame precepts, and the undergoing the ſame penalty, with which God had threatened the ſinner. Becauſe from our hypotheſis it appears, that it is unworthy of God to grant life to man, but on condition of his obeying thoſe precepts; nor poſſible for the truth and juſtice of God to be ſatisfied, unleſs the puniſhment, which the ſinner deſerved, ſhould be inflicted. I add, No creature but man can perform thoſe precepts, which were given to man. This appears, 1. Becauſe the law, which is ſuitable to the nature of man, requires, that he love God with all his ſoul, and ſerve him with his whole body; ſeeing both are God's. None can do this but he who conſiſts of ſoul and body, that is, man. 2. The ſame law requires the love of our neighbour; now, none is our neighbour but man, who is of the ſame blood with us. To this purpoſe is that emphatical ſaying of God

to Israel, *Hide not thyself from thine own flesh.** And thus our Surety ought to cherish us, as one does his own flesh; and consequently we ought to be *of his flesh and of his bones.*† 3. It requires also, that we lay down our lives for our brethren, which, we have shewn above, was eminently contained in the royal law of love. None but man again can do this. For who else is our brother?‡ or who besides could lay down his life for us? No other creature but man could undergo the same sufferings, as hunger, thirst, weariness, death. It became God to threaten sinning man with these things; that even the body, which was the instrument of sin, might also undergo its share of the punishment. And after the threatening, the truth of God could not but inflict these things, either on the sinner, or the Surety. The dignity of the sufferer might indeed sufficiently compensate for the duration of the punishment. But the truth of God admits of no commutation of the species of punishment. Wherefore our Surety was *partaker of flesh and blood, that, through death, he might destroy him that had the power of death.*§ All these things put together, incontestably prove, that our Surety ought to be man, that he might satisfy the law for us.

VI. This is what the apostle means, when he joins these two together by an inseparable connection, *made of a woman*, and *made under the law.*‖ For he intimates, that the principal and immediate scope and end of Christ's incarnation was, that, in the human nature, he might be subject to the law, to which it is under obligation: and so that God, according to the same right, might renew with him the same covenant, which he had before entered into with the first man; which he could

* Is. lviii. 7. † Eph. v. 30. ‡ Heb. ii. 11. § Heb. ii. 14. ‖ Gal. iv. 4.

not have done with any other nature whatever, without a contradiction.

VII. There is this further conſideration: Our Surety ought to have ſuch a nature, in order to our being united to him in one body. For it is neceſſary, that the ſatisfaction of one be as it were the ſatisfaction of all, and the Spirit who fits for a holy and a happy life, ſhould flow from him, as the head, to us as his members; and ſo that he become *the Saviour of the body*.* The ſcripture frequently calls this myſtical union *a marriage*. Now, it is the inviolable law of marriage, that the perſons married be of the ſame nature: *Theſe two ſhall be one fleſh*.† In which words Paul hath taught us, that the myſtery of the ſpiritual marriage of the church with Chriſt lies concealed.‡

VIII. We obſerved, that the *ſecond* condition required in the Surety was, that he be *a righteous and holy man; in all things like unto his brethren, yet without ſin*.§ This holineſs conſiſted in this, that, from the firſt moment of his conception, he ſhould be free from any guilt and ſtain of ſin of his own; and on the contrary, be furniſhed with the original rectitude of the image of God: that, moreover, through the whole courſe of his life, he ſhould keep himſelf from all ſin, and perfectly fulfil all righteouſneſs: and in fine, that he ſhould conſtantly perſevere in that purity to the end, without yielding to any temptation.

IX. And this alſo is clear from what has been already ſaid. For ſeeing our Surety ought to ſave us, according to the firſt treaty of the covenant, whereby perfect holineſs was required of man, it alſo behoved him to be perfectly holy. And as the gate of heaven was ſhut by ſin, it could not be opened again but by holineſs. This

* Eph. v. 23. † Gen. ii. 24. ‡ Eph. v. 31, 32. § Heb. iv. 15.

the apoſtle urges, *For as by one man's diſobedience many were made ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made righteous.** Now, that obedience excludes all ſin. And how, pray, could a ſinner ſatisfy for others, who cannot ſatisfy for himſelf, when by one ſin he forfeits his own ſoul? *For who is this* (from among ſinful men) *that can engage his heart to approach unto me? ſaith the Lord.*† Or who can be our Prieſt, familiarly to approach for us to God, and offer an acceptable ſacrifice and prevalent interceſſion to him, but one who is himſelf pure from every ſin? *Such a high prieſt became us, who is holy, harmleſs, undefiled, ſeparate from ſinners.*‡ He then can offer himſelf, as a lamb *without blemiſh and without ſpot,*§ whoſe offering may be to God *for a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour.*‖ For none other, who cannot offer himſelf to God *without ſpot, can purge the conſcience from dead works.*¶ This was formerly ſignified by the legal purity of the high prieſt, without which it was ſuch a crime for any to intermeddle in holy things, that he was to be puniſhed by death; and by the purity of the beaſts, which were to be without any blemiſh. And ſeeing it is well known, that *God heareth not ſinners,*** whoſe *prayers are an abomination to him;*†† who elſe can be the general Interceſſor and Advocate of all with the Father, but he who is eminently *righteous?*‡‡ In fine, how could he, who is himſelf impure, *ſanctify* the church, *and preſent it to himſelf a glorious church, not having ſpot or wrinkle, or any ſuch thing, but that it ſhould be holy and without blemiſh?*§§ There cannot be more in the effect, than there is in the cauſe. Since all theſe things ought to be done by the Surety, it appears neceſſary, that he be a holy man.

* Rom. v. 19. † Jer. xxx. 21. ‡ Heb. vii. 26. § 1 Pet. i. 19. ‖ Eph. v. 2. ¶ Heb. ix. 14. ** John ix. 31. †† Prov. xxviii. 9. ‡‡ 1 John ii. 1. §§ Eph. v. 26, 27.

X. But here the adorable wiſdom of our God ſhines forth: Our Surety ought not only to be man, but alſo taken from among men, *the Son of man.* For if his human nature was created out of nothing, or out of the earth, he would certainly be true man, yet not our kinſman; not our brother. In order to this, therefore, it became him, like other *children to be a partaker of fleſh and blood,** and to be *born of a woman.*† But it ſeemed inconſiſtent with the unſpotted holineſs of the Surety, that he ſhould be deſcended of the poſterity of Adam, who are all infected with hereditary pollution from him: for *who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?*‡ Here let us adore the unſearchable wiſdom of God. He would have a Surety to be born of a woman, but of her as a virgin. For this, if nothing elſe was intended, was at leaſt an evidence of theſe two things: 1. That the Surety was not from Adam's covenant, as not being born according to the law of nature, and conſequently not under the imputation of Adam's ſin. 2. Nay, that he could not be ſo much as conſidered as exiſting in Adam, when Adam ſinned. Seeing he was not born in virtue of that word, whereby God bleſſed marriage before the fall, *Increaſe and multiply;* but in virtue of the promiſe concerning the ſeed of the woman, which followed on the fall. And thus he was created a new Adam, in oppoſition to the firſt. *For the Lord hath created a new thing in the earth,* NEKEBA TESOBEB GABÆR, *a woman ſhall compaſs a man.*§ We are, it ſeems, to take this in the utmoſt ſignification the words can admit of. That *a woman*, who is only ſuch, and hath nothing of a woman but the ſex, *ſhould compaſs*, not by embrace, but by conception. (For ſuch a compaſſing is meant, as is the work of God alone, and not the vo-

* Heb. ii. 14. † Gal. iv. 4. ‡ Job xiv. 4. § Jer. xxxi. 22.

luntary operation of man.) *A male;* denoting the more excellent ſex: as Rev. xii. 5. *And ſhe brought forth a male child.* This then is *a new thing*, and *a creation* altogether divine. On this depend the bleſſing of the earth, and the ſatiating the weary ſoul, which are promiſed in the following verſes.

XI. It may here be inquired, whether the miraculous nativity from a virgin does, of itſelf, ſecure to the human nature of Chriſt immunity from ſin, and this ought to be fetched from the nature of the thing; or whether, indeed, it has only a reſpect to a ſymbol appointed by God? I ſhall here preſent the reader, for his more accurate meditation, with the words of two great men, who conceive differently of this matter. There is a learned man who ſpeaks thus: "That miraculous nativity from the virgin, really bears no other relation to the holineſs of the conception and nativity of Chriſt, but that of *a ſymbol appointed by God*, whereby he was ſeparated from ſinners: nor could that miracle of itſelf alone, namely, the impregnation of the virgin's womb, ſecure in the leaſt an exemption to the fleſh of Chriſt from the inheritance of ſin: for the origin of ſin is not derived from the male ſex alone, or male ſeed; nor did the apoſtle, Rom. v. ſo underſtand one man Adam, as to exclude Eve: which is here the leading error of ſome."* The other of theſe learned men reaſons in this manner: "He could be born of the virgin without any pollution: becauſe what is in the body of a ſinner, as it is God's creature, is no otherwiſe under curſe and pollution, but in ſo far as it is a part of the ſinner, when he is to be puniſhed, or is the inſtrument of ſin, or the means of the ordinary propagation of nature, as

* Cloppenburg. exercit. de ſanctificata origine carnis Chriſti.

that ſomething ſhould be born reſembling what generates. There might therefore be ſomething in the virgin's body, that was not under a curſe; as the ſweats, and other evacuations from the human body, are not under curſe or guilt, nor a means of transferring guilt; but are parts of matter created by God, and are no longer any part of man."* Perhaps, the ſame learned perſon has elſewhere expreſſed himſelf more clearly, as follows: "He who was born not of father and mother, but of a virgin was not under guilt and condemnation. For he only received from his mother, what was prepared by God; that thence the Son of God might take to himſelf the materials for building a temple. For though what belongs to the ſinner is, on account of the ſinner, to whom it belongs, under the ſame condemnation with the ſinner himſelf; yet that which is ſo contained in the ſubſtance of the ſinner, as that it cannot be a part of his ſubſtance, but prepared by God for an extraordinary generation, is not under condemnation ſolely, becauſe the Redeemer and redeemed partake of fleſh in common. And therefore it is rightly ſaid to be *ſanctified*, that is, *preſerved from* the common *condemnation of the ſons of Adam*. For the word *ſanctified*, cannot in that caſe ſignify *purified*, or delivered from impurity; as it ſignifies, when applied to the other ſons of Adam."† Which of theſe two opinions is the more ſimple and more ſolid, we leave to the judgment of the prudent reader to determine. The words of both ſeemed however to me worthy of being inſerted here.

XII. Thirdly, it is further required in our Surety, that he be *true and eternal God*. *I will help thee, ſaith the Lord*, VEGOALECH KEDOSH ISRAEL, *and thy redeemer, the holy one of Iſrael.*‡ *I, even I am Lord, and*

* Cocceii ſum. theolog. c. 58. 11. † Cap. 34. 12. ‡ Iſ. xli. 14.

*there is no Saviour beſides me.** Salvation is not ſuch a work, that it can be in truth ſaid, *The Lord hath done all this.*† It is peculiar to the true Saviour to ſay of himſelf, what *Iſaiah* propheſied,‡ ACH BAHOVAH LI AMAR TZEDAKOTH VANGODS NGADAV IABO *Surely in the Lord (he ſaid to me*, or *concerning me*, namely, the Father, who *beareth witneſs of Chriſt*, John viii. 18.) *are righteouſneſs and ſtrength; even to him ſhall men come.* And the reaſons are evident.

XIII. None but God can reſtore us to true liberty. If we conceive, that any creature could redeem and deliver us, we ſhould become the peculiar property of that creature. For he who ſets us free, makes a purchaſe of us for his property and poſſeſſion.§ But it is a manifeſt contradiction, to be freed and to be free, and yet at the ſame time be the property and ſervant of any creature. True liberty conſiſts in ſubjection to God alone; ſo that all things are ours, and we belong to God, and Chriſt himſelf.‖ Adam, before the fall, was under no dominion but that of God. If, by our deliverance from the fall, we were put under the dominion of any creature, that would not be a deliverance, but a change of ſervitude. Therefore our Lord ſays, *If the Son ſhall make you free, ye ſhall be free indeed.*¶

XIV. None too but God can give us eternal life; which conſiſts in the moſt intimate union with God; nay, in having God for our inheritance, poſſeſſion, and treaſure, and even *our portion for ever.*** But what creature can poſſibly beſtow God upon any? None but God himſelf can give God. Hence theſe two are joined, *the true God and eternal life.*††

* If. xliii. 11. † Deut. xxxii. 27. ‡ Chap. xlv. 24. § 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. ‖ 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23. ¶ John viii. 36. ** Pſal. lxxiii. 26. †† 1 John v. 20.

XV. None but God can give us EXOUSIAN, *power* or *right to become the ſons of God*;* which however belongs to the office of Surety. For who but God will give us the Spirit, by whom we become the Sons of God by regeneration, ſo that *of him the whole* PATRIA, *family in heaven and earth, may be named?*† Who but God *will give us theſe great and precious promiſes, by which we might be partakers of the divine nature?*‡ Who elſe but God himſelf, who alone is Lord of heaven, will bequeath to us by teſtament the heavenly inheritance? And who but God will give us that Spirit, who is ſo the Spirit of the Father, as to be alſo the Spirit of the Son, *by whom we may cry Abba, Father*,§ and who *beareth witneſs with our ſpirit* concerning the future inheritance?‖

XVI. In fine, for man to glory in any one as his Saviour, and give him the honor of the new creation, or reſign himſelf to his pleaſure, and become his property, and ſay to him, Thou art Lord of my ſoul; is an honor to which no mere creature can have the leaſt claim. *In Jehovah ſhall all the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory.*¶ *My ſpirit hath rejoiced in* GOD *my Saviour*, Luke i. 47. Whom we acknowledge to be our Saviour, we muſt likewiſe acknowledge to be *our Judge, our Lawgiver, and our King.*** A holy ſoul can only thus rejoice in God; *The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice, let the multitude of iſles be glad.*††

XVII. It appears then, that none, but he who is true God, could poſſibly be Surety; but whether was it abſolutely neceſſary, that he ſhould be the Son of God, and the ſecond perſon in the Trinity? Here we cannot commend the raſhneſs of the ſchoolmen, who too boldly meaſure the things of God by the ſtandard of

* John i. 12. † Eph. iii. 15. ‡ 2 Pet. i. 4. § Gal. iv. 6.
‖ Rom. viii. 16, 17. ¶ Iſ. xlv. 25. ** Iſ. xxxiii. 22. †† Pſal. xcvii. 1.

their own underſtanding. No better reaſon can be aſſigned for the *Son's* undertaking the ſuretiſhip, than the holy good pleaſure of the adorable Trinity. But when it is revealed to us, it is our duty to obſerve and proclaim the wiſdom and goodneſs of God in this conſtitution.

XVIII. Did not God moſt wiſely order, that he who created man, ſhould reſtore, and as it were create him anew? and that he, who is the perſonal Word of God, which called light out of darkneſs, and by which all things were made,* ſhould be the *publiſher of the word of the goſpel*, whereby God ſhines in the hearts of the elect, and new creatures, not yet exiſting, are effectually called, and by that call brought, as it were, into being? Further, as the ſecond perſon alone is the Son, and our ſalvation conſiſts in adoption, was it not proper, that the Son of God ſhould become the Son of man, that, having obtained a right of adoption by him, we might be made his brethren and co-heirs? Add to this, that the Son alone is called *the image of the Father*,† and by way of eminence, *the beloved of the Father*.‡ Seeing man therefore had by ſin ſhamefully defaced the image of God, which he received in the firſt creation; and thereby moſt juſtly expoſed himſelf to the hatred of God; was it not worthy of God to reſtore that image by his own eſſential image, in the human nature he had aſſumed; in order, by that means, to open a way for our return to the favor and love of the Father? In fine, could the philanthropy and love of the Father be more illuſtriouſly diſplayed to us, than in giving his only begotten Son to us and for us, that in him we might behold the Father's glory? The Lord Jeſus himſelf leads us to this.§

* John. i. 3. † Col. i. 15. Heb. i. 3. ‡ Matth. iii. 17. Col. i. 13. § John iii. 16.

XIX. The laſt condition requiſite in the Surety is, that he ſhould be *God-man; God and man, at the ſame time, in unity of perſon: one Mediator between God and men.** For as it was neceſſary, he ſhould be *man*, and alſo *God*, and *one* Surety; it was neceſſary, he ſhould be both theſe in unity of perſon; *God manifeſted in the fleſh;*† *The word made fleſh;*‡ *Of the ſeed of David according to the fleſh*, in ſuch a manner, as at the ſame time to be *the Son of God with power.*§ Which may be further made appear in this manner.

XX. Had he been God only, he could neither have been ſubject, nor have obeyed, nor ſuffered: if mere man, his obedience, ſubjection, and ſuffering, would not have been of ſufficient value for the redemption of the elect. Nay, a mere creature is ſo bound to fulfil all righteouſneſs for itſelf, that its righteouſneſs cannot be imputed and imparted to others: and if a man, perfectly indeed holy, but yet a mere man, ſhould according to the law of love, offer himſelf to death for his brother, he himſelf would doubtleſs obtain a reward by his righteouſneſs; but could merit for a guilty perſon either nothing, or, if any thing, exemption from puniſhment at moſt. And therefore it behoved our Surety to be man, that he might be capable to ſubmit, obey, and ſuffer; and at the ſame time God, that the ſubjection, obedience, and ſuffering of this perſon God-man, might, on account of his infinite dignity, be imputed to others, and be ſufficient for ſaving all, to whom it is imputed.

XXI. Moreover, a mere creature could not bear the load of divine wrath, ſo as to remove it, and riſe again, when he had done. *Who knoweth the power of thine anger; even according to thy fear, ſo is thy wrath:*‖ ſee Neh. i. 6. It was therefore neceſſary for our Surety to

* 1 Tim. ii. 5. † 1 Tim. iii. 16. ‡ John i. 14. § Rom. i. 3, 4.
‖ Pſal. xc. 11.

be more than man, that, by the infinite power of his Godhead, he might ſupport the aſſumed human nature, and ſo be able to bear the fierceneſs of divine wrath, and conquer every kind of death.

XXII. I ſhall not conceal what is objected to this argument; namely, that God could have ſo ſupported the human nature, though not perſonally united to himſelf, by his divine power, as to have rendered it capable to endure and conquer all manner of ſorrows. I for my part dare not refuſe this. But yet that would not be ſufficient in the preſent caſe. Becauſe, by that hypotheſis, it would be God himſelf, by the Surety, who would have vanquiſhed his enemies. But it is neceſſary, that our Surety ſhould do this by his own power, that *his own arm ſhould bring ſalvation unto him;** and therefore be *the mighty one of Jacob*,† *the mighty God*,‡ himſelf *ſtronger than the ſtrong man*;§ *having life in himſelf*,‖ and *having power to take his life again*.¶ To which is required *the exceeding greatneſs of his power*,** and ſo ſhould *be declared to be the Son of God with power*.††

XXIII. Theſe are the tremendous myſteries of our religion, *which were kept ſecret ſince the world began, but are now made manifeſt, and, by the ſcriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlaſting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith*.‡‡ From hence the divinity of the Chriſtian religion appears with evidence. What penetration of men or angels was capable of deviſing things ſo myſterious, ſo ſublime, and ſo far ſurpaſſing the capacity of all created beings? How adorable do the wiſdom, juſtice, holineſs, truth, goodneſs, and philanthropy of God, diſplay them-

* Iſ. lxiii. 5. † Iſ. lx. 16. ‡ Iſ. ix. 6. § Luke xi. 21, 22. ‖ John v. 26. ¶ John x. 18. ** Eph. i. 19, 20. †† Rom. i. 4. ‡‡ Rom. xvi. 25, 26.

ſelves in contriving, giving, and perfecting this mean of our ſalvation? How calmly does conſcience, overwhelmed with the burden of its ſins, acquieſce in ſuch a Surety, and in ſuch a ſuretiſhip; here at length obſerving a method of our reconciliation, both worthy of God, and ſafe for man? Who, on contemplating theſe things in the light of the Spirit, would not break out into the praiſes of the moſt holy, the moſt righteous, the moſt true, the moſt gracious, and the moſt high God? O! the depth of the wiſdom and knowledge of God! O the myſteries *which angels deſire to look into!* Glory to the Father who raiſed up, accepted, and gave us ſuch a Surety! Glory to the Son, who clothing himſelf in human fleſh, ſo willingly, ſo patiently, and ſo conſtantly, performed ſuch an engagement for us. Glory to the Holy Spirit, the revealer, the witneſs, and the earneſt, of ſo great happineſs for us. All hail! O! Chriſt Jeſus, true and eternal God, and true and holy man, both in one, who retaineſt the properties of both natures in the unity of thy perſon. Thee we acknowledge, thee we worſhip, to thee we betake ourſelves, at thy feet we fall down, from thy hand alone we look for ſalvation. Thou art the only Saviour. We deſire to be thy peculiar property, we are ſo by thy grace, and ſhall remain ſuch for ever. Let the whole world of thine elect, with us, know, acknowledge, and adore thee, and thus at length be ſaved by thee. This is the ſum of our faith, of our hope, and of all our wiſhes. Amen.

CHAP. V.

Of the Suretiſhip and Satisfaction of Chriſt.

HAVING thus ſpoken of the *perſon* of the Surety, ſo far as the nature of our deſign requires, now is the

time and place, to treat a little more accurately of *the satisfaction* itself, which by his suretiship he undertook to give. For he is called *the Surety of the covenant* or *testament*;* not only, nor principally, because he engaged *to us* in *the name of God*, to fulfil the promises contained in that testament, if we obeyed his commands, as Curcellæus, treading in the footsteps of his master Socinus artfully pretends; but because he engaged *to God for us*, to perform all those conditions in our stead, upon which we were to receive the testamentary inheritance. Hezekiah desired the saving fruit of this suretiship, when he prayed, Is. xxxviii. 14. *I am oppressed*, NGAREBENI, *undertake for me.* And God himself, when he gives to his Son all the glory of his suretiship, expresses himself thus:† *For who is this that* NGARAB *engaged his heart to approach unto me? saith the Lord.* That is, What mortal, nay, what creature dares engage, to perform all those things, which are incumbent on the priest, who shall have a right to approach to me for himself and his people? Our Surety therefore thus engaged to God for us. To what purpose is such a Surety, who should only engage to us in the name of God? If Christ be a mere man, such as they represent him, could his engagement give us a greater assurance of the truth of the divine promises, than if we heard them immediately from the mouth of God himself? Was it not previously necessary, that God, who cannot lie, should first of all engage to us, that the man Christ would be true in all his sayings, before we could with sure confidence rely upon them? Is it not much better and more safe, to rely upon the oath of the infallible God, by which he has *abundantly confirmed to the heirs of promise, the immuta-*

* Heb. vii. 22. † Jer. xxx. 21.

bility of his counsel,* than on the declaration of a mere man, let him be ever so true and faithful? And what peculiar excellency would Christ have had above others in this case, to be dignified with the honor of being the alone Surety, had he only, by the publication of a saving doctrine, which he confirmed by his martyrdom, assured us of the certainty of the promises of grace: seeing the other prophets and apostles of Christ did the very same, not scrupling to undergo the most cruel deaths, in order to seal with their blood the truth of God's promises, which they had declared? What can vilify Christ, or make void his suretiship, if this does not?

II. Christ therefore is called our Surety, because he *engaged to God to make satisfaction for us*. Which satisfaction again is not to be understood in the Socinian sense, as if it only consisted in this; that Christ most perfectly fulfilled *the will* of God, and fully executed every thing God enjoined him, on account of our salvation, and so in the fullest manner satisfied God, and that for us, that is, *on our account*, for our highest and eternal *good*: as Crellius, when making the greatest concessions, would fain put us off with these fair words. But it consists in this, that Christ, in *our room* and stead, did, both by doing and suffering, satisfy *divine justice*, both the *legislatory*, *the retributive*, *and vindictive*, in the most perfect manner fulfilling all the righteousness of the law, which the law otherwise required of us, in order to immunity from punishment, and to our having a right to eternal life. If Christ did this, as we are immediately to shew he did, nothing hinders, why we may not affirm, that he satisfied for us in the fullest sense of the word. For to what purpose is it superciliously to reject a term so commodious, because not to be met

* Heb. vi. 17.

with on this subject in scripture, if we can prove the thing signified by it?

III. We find his engaging to make this satisfaction, Psal. xl. 6, 7, 8. expressed by Christ to God in these words: *Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened: burnt-offering and sin-offering hast thou not required. Then said I, Lo! I come: in the volume of thy book it is written of me: I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my bowels* [or heart.] Where observe, 1. The compact between the Lord Christ and the Father, by virtue of which Christ calls the Father *his God.* 2. That Christ freely, and of his own accord, entered into this compact with the Father; since he compares himself to a servant, whose ears were bored, in order that he might voluntarily serve his beloved Lord. 3. That, by virtue of this compact, Christ presented himself to do the acceptable RATZON will of his God. 4. That that will was expressed by a law, which Christ has within his bowels, which he loves from his soul, and is to keep with all his heart. 5. That that law requires, not only perfect righteousness, in order to obtain a right to eternal life, but also the bearing of the punishment due to the sinner. Because all this was signified by the sacrifices, gifts, burnt-offerings, and sin-offerings of the law. For when the sinner offered to God beasts or corn, which were given to himself for food, and was careful to have them consumed by fire, as it were in his own room; he thereby confessed, that, on account of his sins, he deserved the most dreadful destruction, and even the eternal flames of hell. 6. That these external ceremonies of sacrifice could never, without a respect to the thing signified, please God, nor *purge the conscience from dead works:* therefore Christ offered himself, in order to accomplish that will

of God, by which we are ſanctified,* both by fulfilling all the righteouſneſs preſcribed by the law, and by undergoing the guilt of our ſins, that he might atone for them as an expiatory ſacrifice. All theſe things are contained in the ſuretiſhip of Chriſt deſcribed by David.

IV. Chriſt could, without any injury, undertake ſuch a ſuretiſhip; 1. Becauſe he was the Lord of his own life, which, on account of his power over it, he could engage to lay down for others; *I have power to lay it down.*† 2. Becauſe he was able to perform what he undertook, by enduring condign puniſhment, by fulfilling all righteouſneſs, and, in both, performing an obedience of ſuch value, becauſe he is God-man in one perſon, as to be more than equivalent to the obedience of all the elect. 3. Becauſe, by that means, he gave an inſtance of an extraordinary and incomprehenſible degree of love, both to the glory of God, and the ſalvation of men. 4. Nor has his human nature any reaſon to complain, becauſe a creature could have no greater glory, than to be hypoſtatically united with a divine perſon, and be ſubſervient to him for accompliſhing the greateſt work, which the whole choir of elect angels will, with aſtoniſhment, celebrate through eternity; eſpecially, ſeeing it was aſſured, that after its ſufferings, which were indeed the greateſt that could be, yet of a ſhort duration, that which was *made a little lower than the angels*, ſhould obtain a name above every name.

V. It was alſo worthy of God the Father, both to procure and accept of this ſuretiſhip of his Son; becauſe, in the execution of it, there is a manifeſtation of *the truth* of God, exactly fulfilling every thing he had promiſed in his law to juſtice, and had threatened againſt ſin; and of *the goodneſs* of God, reconciling to himſelf

* Heb. x. 10. † John x. 18.

sinful and wretched man, on giving and admitting a proper Mediator; and of *the justice* of God, not clearing the guilty, without a sufficient satisfaction; nay, accepting a far more excellent satisfaction, than could ever be given by man himself, because of the more excellent obedience of Christ, and his more meritorious sufferings;* and of *the holiness* of God, not admitting man unto a blessed communion with himself, unless justified by the blood, and sanctified by the Spirit of Christ; in fine, of *the all-sufficiency* of God, who, as what seemed almost a thing incredible, is, by this means, become, without any diminution to any of his perfections, the God and salvation of the sinner. Hence it is, that the Lord Jesus, in the execution of his undertaking, professes, he manifested the *name*, that is, the perfections of God,† particularly those which we have just now mentioned. *I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy loving-kindness and thy truth from the great congregation.*‡ Since then nothing can be thought more worthy of God, than the manifesting, in the most illustrious manner, the glory of the divine perfections, and these perfections shine forth no where with greater lustre, than in the satisfaction of Christ, it was altogether worthy of God to procure and admit his undertaking such a satisfaction.

VI. Nor, by the admission of such suretiship, is there any abrogation of, or derogation to, the divine law; as little any contradiction of, or substitution of another; but only a favorable construction put upon it; because the law, as it stood, but only taken in a favorable sense, was most fully satisfied by the Redeemer, who was in the closest union with us, when he paid the due ransom.

* Rom. iii. 25. † John xvii. 6. ‡ Psal. xl. 10.

Whence the apoſtle ſaid,* *the righteouſneſs of the law* was fulfilled by Chriſt. We ſhall not improperly conceive of the whole, in the following manner: The law declares, that there is no admiſſion for any to eternal life, but on the account of a perfect and abſolutely-complete righteouſneſs; alſo, that every ſinner ſhall undergo the penalty of death, the dominion of which is eternal. However, it is a doubtful matter, and not explained by the law, whether that perfect righteouſneſs muſt neceſſarily be performed by the very perſon to be ſaved, or whether a ſurety may be admitted, to perform it in his room. Again, it is doubtful, whether it was neceſſary the ſinner ſhould, in his own perſon, ſuffer the deſerved puniſhment, or whether he could truly undergo it in the perſon of a ſponſor. In fine it is a matter of doubt, whether he, who was to undergo the penalty, ought to do ſo to an infinite degree, with reſpect to duration; or whether he could undergo it, if that dominion of death could be aboliſhed, by the ſufficient dignity and worth of the perſon who ſhould undergo it, and ſo death be ſwallowed up in victory. Strict juſtice would, as the words ſeem to import at firſt view, demand the former: but the favorable conſtruction, which, according to Ariſtotle,† "is an amendment of the law, where it is deficient, on account of its univerſality," admits of the latter, where it can be obtained; as really was, and is, the caſe with Chriſt and Chriſtians. Thus therefore, that in which the law ſeemed to be defective from its univerſality, comes to be corrected; not as to the intention of God the Lawgiver, which is altogether invariable, and always moſt perfect; but as to the expreſs form of the words: almoſt in the ſame manner, as if a father ſhould be admitted to pay an equivalent fine

* Rom. viii. 4. † Ethic. lib. v. c. 10.

for his ſon, and inſtead of ſilver, make payment in gold. This would be a favorable interpretation of the law.

VII. Nor was it unjuſt, for Chriſt to be puniſhed for us: ſeeing Socinus himſelf and Crellius own, that it was not unjuſt, that the moſt grievous torments, nay, death itſelf, might be inflicted on Chriſt, though moſt innocent; which alſo appears from the event. For God, in right of his dominion, could lay all thoſe afflictions on Chriſt; eſpecially with the effectual conſent of the Lord Jeſus himſelf, who had power over his own life. The whole difficulty lies in *the formality* of the puniſhment. But as Chriſt, by the moſt free good pleaſure of his own will, took upon himſelf our tranſgreſſions, and the treſpaſſes we had committed againſt the divine majeſty, and offered himſelf as a Surety for them; God, as the ſupreme Governor, could juſtly exact puniſhment of Chriſt in our room, and actually did ſo. And thus MUSAR SHELOMENU, *the chaſtiſement of our peace*, that *exemplary puniſhment* inflicted on Chriſt, in which God, as by the brighteſt example, ſhews his implacable hatred to ſin, but which brings pardon and peace unto us, was upon him.* For that is here MUSAR *the exemplary puniſhment*, in which God's wrath againſt ſin is diſcovered, well adapted to deter others from it. Thus Jer. xxx. 14. MUSAR ACHDSARI *the puniſhment of a cruel one;* and Prov. vii. 22. MUSAR ÆVIL *the exemplary puniſhment of a fool;* and Ezek. v. 15. *It ſhall be a reproach, and a taunt, an inſtruction,* MUSAR [an example] *and an aſtoniſhment.*

VIII. But we certainly take too much upon us, when we preſume to examine the equity of the divine government by the ſtandard of our reaſon: when the

* If. liii. 5.

fact is plain, we are always to vindicate God againſt the ſophiſtry of our fooliſh reaſonings. That man is certainly the author of a monſtrous, horrible, and deteſtable hereſy, and diſcovers a profane arrogance, who, like Socinus, is not aſhamed to write as follows: "As for my part, indeed, though ſuch a thing ſhould be found not once, but frequently, in the ſacred records, I would not, on that account, believe it to be ſo." But modeſty ſhould teach us rather to ſay; "That truly for my part, though my reaſon, which I know is blind and fooliſh, and apt to be clamorous againſt God, ſhould a thouſand times gainſay it, I would not therefore preſume to call in queſtion, what I find but once in the ſacred records; nor, by ſeeking ſome other interpretation, would I force on the words of ſcripture, any meaning more conſonant to my reaſon." When therefore we ſhall have proved from holy writ, that the Lord Chriſt has made ſatisfaction to the juſtice of God, we ought not to be thought to have proved that there is any injuſtice in it: according to the maxim, which nature itſelf dictates, that all the ways of God are righteouſneſs and truth.

IX. No Chriſtian queſtions, that Chriſt fulfilled all righteouſneſs. The multitude of the Jews teſtified concerning him, *He hath done all things well.** He declared this truly, as he did every thing elſe, concerning himſelf: *I do always thoſe things that pleaſe him.*† Hence he boldly appealed to his enemies, *Which of you convinceth me of ſin?*‡ nay, even to his Father himſelf, *O God, thou knoweſt my fooliſhneſs, and my ſins are not hid from thee.*§ For I ſuppoſe, this pſalm contains a prayer of the Lord Chriſt, as appears from ſeveral parts of it being often quoted in the New Teſtament: And

* Mark vii. 37. † John viii. 29. ‡ Ver. 46. § Pſal. lxix. 5.

theſe words, I think, contain a proteſtation of the Lord Jeſus to his Father, of his own innocence; of which Theodorus in Catena, has given no improper paraphraſe: "Whether I have been guilty of any fault againſt them, thou thyſelf knoweſt; and art my witneſs, I have done nothing." But I think the meaning may be more fully expreſſed thus: "It is true, my God, I have taken guilt upon me, and am made a curſe: but thou knoweſt all my ſins even to the ſlighteſt offence, for which I ſuffer; that in all there is not the leaſt fault of mine, by which I have violated thy law, ſo as to *reſtore what I have taken.*" The truth of this proteſtation the Father atteſts, when he calls Chriſt his *righteous ſervant*,* and *juſtified him in the Spirit*,† declaring, that, as man, he was innocent of every crime falſely laid to his charge; on the contrary, that he honored his Father by his perfect obedience; and that as Mediator, he diligently executed the office aſſigned him, ſo that he was deficient in nothing.

X. 'Tis allowed, that the moſt holy obedience of Chriſt was for our good: becauſe therein we have, 1. A confirmation of his heavenly doctine; the works of his moſt perfect holineſs, no leſs than his miracles which he performed, being a demonſtration that he was a preacher of divine truth, ſent down from heaven. 2. A living law and moſt perfect pattern of holineſs, worthy both of God and of the children of God; of which we had an exact delineation in the written law, but which ſhining forth in its lively viſage and native light in Chriſt and his actions, is fitted to ſtir up every man who beholds it with a ſpiritual eye, to the love of it. Mankind wanted this, even to diſcern the unſpotted image of the

* Iſ. liii. 11. † 1 Tim. iii. 16.

divine holineſs in any of their brethren; which at length they obtained in Chriſt, who *left us an example, that we ſhould follow his ſteps.** 3. A pointing out of the way to heaven; Chriſt teaching us not only by his words, but his actions, that *without holineſs no man ſhall ſee the Lord.*†

XI. But we muſt proceed a ſtep further, and affirm, that the obedience of Chriſt was accompliſhed by him *in our room*, in order thereby to obtain for us a right to eternal life. The law, which God will have ſecured inviolable, admits none to glory, but on condition of perfect obedience. This none was ever poſſeſſed of but Chriſt, who beſtows it freely on his own people. This is what the apoſtle declares, *But the free gift of Jeſus Chriſt is of many offences* EIS DIKAIOMA, *for the ground of righteouſneſs* [*unto juſtification:*‡] that is, though we want thoſe works, for which the reward may be due; nay, though, for ſo many ſins, we may have deſerved an eternal curſe: nevertheleſs, there is ſomething, which is ſufficient, not only for aboliſhing many offences, but likewiſe to be the meritorious cauſe of righteouſneſs; namely, the obedience of one man; and it becomes ours by gratuitous gift. More clearly ſtill, ver. 19. *For as by one man's diſobedience many were made* [conſtituted] *ſinners, ſo by the obedience of one ſhall many be made* [conſtituted] *righteous.* The *former one man* was Adam, the root and federal head of all mankind. By his diſobedience, the whole multitude of men belonging to him, was involved in the guilt of the curſe: and as he ſuſtained the perſon of all, what he did amiſs, is accounted as done by all. *The other* is *the one man* Chriſt, who neither ſinned in and with Adam, nor on whom the dominion of ſin and death paſſed, and who

* 1 Pet. ii. 21. † Heb. xii. 14. ‡ Rom. v. 16.

is worthy to be both Lord and Head, a second Adam, and the origin and source of the inheritance to be devolved on his brethren. He is possessed of an *obedience*, even to the whole law of God, which enjoined him to have a perfect love for the glory of his Father, and for the salvation of his brethren. By that obedience, the *collective body* of those who belong to him, *are constituted righteous;* that is, are judged to have a right to eternal life, no less than if every one had performed that obedience in his own person.

XII. Nor ought it to appear strange, that that obedience of Christ is sufficient to acquire to them a right to eternal life; even though it became him *as man*, to yield obedience *for himself*. For we are here to consider *the dignity of the person* obeying; who being man in such a manner, as at the same time to be the eternal and infinite God, is much more excellent than all the elect taken together; and therefore his obedience is deservedly esteemed of such value, that it may be imputed to all, for obtaining a right to a blessed immortality. And, although the divinity, in the abstract, did not obey; yet he, who did, is God; and thus the divinity of the person contributes very much to the dignity of the obedience. It is true indeed, that, *as man*, he owed obedience *for himself;* but since he became man on our account, he also performed that obedience in our room. Moreover, as man, he was not necessarily under the law, as *prescribing the condition of happiness;* because, if we set aside the consideration of the suretiship undertaken for us, he would have enjoyed all manner of happiness, from the first moment of his incarnation, on account of the union of the humanity with the Godhead, as we have more fully shewn, chap. iii. sect. 13, 14.

XIII. It would likewise be false to infer from this, that if Christ performed obedience for us, we ourselves

are under no neceſſity of obeying; becauſe no demand can be made on the principal debtor, for what the Surety has performed in his room. For our obedience may be conſidered, either as it is *the duty* of the rational creature, with reſpect to his ſovereign Lord; or as it is a *condition* of acquiring a right to eternal life. In the latter reſpect Chriſt accompliſhed it for us, and therefore, under that relation, it neither is, nor can be required of us, as if, for want of perfect obedience, we could be excluded from eternal life. But in the former reſpect, we by all means owe obedience, the obligation of which is rather increaſed than diminiſhed by this inſtance of Chriſt's love. For what more proper, than by this to ſhew our gratitude, and declare not ſo much by words as actions, that we acknowledge him for our Lord, who has purchaſed us for himſelf as his peculiar people? In fine, that as adopted ſons we decline no obedience to our heavenly Father, whom his natural Son and of the ſame ſubſtance with himſelf, ſo cheerfully obeyed.

XIV. But beſides, Chriſt ſatisfied *the vindictive juſtice* of God, not only *for our good*, but alſo *in our room*, by enduring thoſe moſt dreadful ſufferings, both in ſoul and body, which we had deſerved, and from which he, by undergoing them, did ſo deliver us, that they could not, with the wrath and curſe of God, as the proper puniſhment of our ſin, be inflicted on us. If there is any point in our divinity accurately proved, and ſolidly defended againſt the exceptions of the Socinians, by illuſtrious perſons in the church, it is certainly this; which I chuſe not to repeat, deſiring the reader to fetch the arguments from a Grotius, a Junius, a Turrettine, a Hoornbeek, an Eſſenius, and the like renowned heroes; which will baffle all the efforts of the adverſaries, properly to anſwer.

CHAP. VI.

What Sufferings of Christ are satisfactory.

BUT it is really to be lamented, that, in these our days, a new question should be started among the orthodox, namely, which of the sufferings of Christ ought to be deemed satisfactory in our room? There is one in particular, who seems to acknowledge none of the sufferings of Christ to be satisfactory for us, but those which he underwent during the three hours of the solar darkness, while he was upon the cross, and before he expired; excluding from the number of satisfactory sufferings, those agonies which he endured in the garden, the night in which he was apprehended, and that blood which he shed before, and when he was crucified, and after he expired on the cross. He had not, says he, commenced his satisfactory actions, when he had, by a word, levelled his enemies with the ground, cured Malchus, and promised paradise to the thief: no expiation was yet made when an angel came to strengthen him. Nay, he affirms, that Christ did not suffer corporal death as our Surety, and in our room, and that consequently it belongs not to the satisfaction, which he made to the justice of God, if indeed he then fully satisfied God when he died. But in case Christ should seem to have suffered all these things in vain, the learned person concludes, that they were done, in order to satisfy the veracity of God, which had foretold that thus it *should* be, and to fulfil the types by which they were prefigured in the Old Testament. Distinguishing, moreover, between *convincing* and *compensating* punishments, between *warlike* sufferings and *judiciary*; he calls those compensating and judiciary, which Christ endured dur-

ing the three hours of darkneſs; the others only convincing and warlike ſufferings, having this tendency, that Chriſt might learn to become a merciful High Prieſt.

II. But it will be worth while to trace the hypotheſis of this very learned perſon from the foundation; which he has done himſelf very accurately, in a letter to a friend, publiſhed after the firſt and ſecond editions of my work.* For he maintains, 1. That when God threatened man, if he ſinned, with death, he meant that death, which our firſt parents incurred on the very day they ſinned, and which Chriſt the Surety underwent in the room and ſtead of ſome, and which the damned themſelves, who are without a ſurety, ſhall ſuffer and be forced to undergo for themſelves. Now, that is *the death of the whole man;* becauſe the ſubject of it is man, made up of ſoul and body united; and it conſiſts not only in the privation of the ſenſe of God's favor, and of communion with him, and of a joyful delight in the enjoyment of him; but is alſo attended with all the torture and racking pain, which the wrath of God and his omnipotence can inflict. 2. Our firſt parents underwent that death immediately upon their ſin: for in the cool of the ſame day in which they ſinned, when drawing towards the evening, they heard the voice of the Lord continually walking in the garden. It was not that articulate voice, which Adam was before accuſtomed to hear, and was afterwards pleaſed with its ſound; but ſuch as was heard at Sinai, Exod. xix. 16, 17. and deſcribed Pſal. xxix. & lxxvii. 18, 19. The voice of thunder and lightening, a token of God's wrath and power, which the guilty creature could neither bear nor avoid, which made Adam and Eve hide themſelves in the thickeſt of the trees of the garden, juſt as the damn-

* Jac. Alting. epiſt. ad Joh. Rudol. Wetſt. oper. tom. ult. p. 393.

ed will desire to do, Rev. vi. 15. 3. While our first parents endured this threatened death, satisfaction was made to the veracity of God, but not to his justice, demanding a plenary and sufficient compensation. But, on account of the mediatorial covenant between the Father and Son, there intervened the long-suffering of God, or a deferring of his wrath, which removed that death from men, and deferred it to the day of wrath and the last judgment. 4. Christ the Surety, in the fulness of time, underwent this same death of the whole man, in soul and body united, while, hanging on the cross, he was forsaken of God, and, at the same time, had the sensation of his most dreadful wrath, who, while demanding payment of him, was pleased to bruise him: a bruising not inflicted by men, but immediately by God, who punished him with affliction and imprisonment, which will be the punishment of the damned; as it was of Christ, who is said to be UMENGUNNÆ and MENGOTZÆR *afflicted* and *in prison*, Is. liii. 4, 8. 5. Men were not able to behold this dreadful part of his punishment: a most thick and outward darkness concealing Christ from every eye. His whole man suffered this death, till divine justice was satisfied; and it sufficiently appeared to have been satisfied, when God removed the darkness, that the creature, who had before acted as an enemy against him, on whom God was taking vengeance, might again refresh him; and when he likewise comforted him with a sense of his paternal love, so that he could now call God his Father, and commend his spirit into his hands, &c. 6. Moreover, he felt and properly bore this death on the cross, when he cried out, *My God! why hast thou forsaken me?* He dreaded this death in the garden, as he saw it coming upon him, which is therefore called the *antepassion*; and he was delivered from it, when he said, *It is finished*. 7. The

Mediator Chriſt was bound, by his covenant-engagement, to this death alone, and neither to ſpiritual death, which ſuppoſes a want of rectitude, nor to corporal death; who when he was made known in the firſt goſpel-promiſe, Gen. iii. 15. no mention was yet made of corporal death, till ver. 19. He therefore could not be bound to that by any vicarious title. The apoſtle tells us, what his corporal death was, Heb. x. 20. When the blood of the ſacrifice was ſhed for ſin, atonement was made: but in order to preſent it to God, the prieſt carried the blood, which procured the atonement, into the holy of holies; and the vail, which denoted ſeparation by ſin, was made to give way. In like manner alſo, when Chriſt completed his death, or endured the whole load of anguiſh and wrath, having obtained eternal redemption, which he teſtified by his ſaying, *It is finiſhed*, he was to carry his blood, or ſoul, into the heavenly ſanctuary. The vail ſtanding in the way was his human nature, which, upon taking upon him the ſins of the elect, kept him at a diſtance from God; but after ſatisfaction made, that vail was rent aſunder, by the ſeparation of ſoul and body, and conveyed his ſpirit, by an open way, to the preſence of God. And thus *the corporal death* of Chriſt belongs not to the *meritorious*, (which may be done by the alone death of man, not ſeparated with reſpect to his eſſential parts) but to the *repreſenting ſatisfaction*. Thus far this learned perſon. And who can deny, but theſe things are ingeniouſly deviſed, and learnedly connected? But whether they are as ſolid, as they are uncommon, I imagine I may, with the conſent of the lovers of truth, modeſtly inquire.

III. I remember to have learned, in the communion of the reformed church, to the following effect: 1. That the death wherewith God threatened man for ſin,

compriſes in its whole extent all that miſery, which, by the juſteſt diſpleaſure of God, has followed upon ſin, and to which the ſinner man is obnoxious all his life, and whoſe principal part conſiſts in the want of the favor of God, and in the keeneſt ſenſe of the divine curſe, to be chiefly inflicted, when it ſhall ſo pleaſe God. 2. That Chriſt, by the interpoſition of his engagements for the elect, took upon himſelf all that curſe, which man was liable to on account of ſin; whence it was, that, in order to the payment of the debt he engaged for, he led a life, in the aſſumed human nature, ſubject to many viciſſitudes of miſery, juſt like the life of a human ſinner. 3. That, as God uſes much forbearance with reſpect to ſinners, and moderates the bitterneſs of life with ſome ſweetneſs of patience, till the day of vengeance, and of the retribution of his righteous judgment, when the whole weight of the curſe of God ſhall light upon the condemned ſinner; ſo alſo Chriſt, when in the form of a ſervant, had not always ſuch a ſenſe of the painful effects of the ſins that were laid upon him, but that he ſometimes rejoiced in an eminent mixture of favor; till the hour and power of darkneſs came, when, being called to the bar, he had every thing dreadful to undergo. 4. That as that death, which conſiſts in the ſeparation of ſoul and body, is inflicted on the ſinner man, as the ſad effect of the wrath of God; ſo in like manner Chriſt underwent the ſame death, that, in this reſpect alſo, making ſatisfaction to divine juſtice, he might remove all the curſe of that death from the elect. 5. In fine, that as all thoſe miſeries, taken together, are what ſin deſerves; ſo Chriſt, who by his engagement, took upon himſelf all the debt of the elect, did, by all theſe miſeries, to which he was ſubject all his life, ſatisfy divine juſtice; ſo that taken all together, they conſtitute the

ranſom which was due for our ſins. This, if I miſtake not, is the common opinion of our divines, which our catechiſm has alſo expreſſed, queſt. 37. namely, that all the ſufferings which Chriſt endured both in ſoul and body, through the whole courſe of his life, from its commencement to the moſt dreadful death of the croſs, conſtitute his one and perfect ſatisfaction; though it be certain, that thoſe were the moſt grievous ſufferings, with which he encountered on the laſt night and day; and that thoſe which he bore in his body, were far exceeded by thoſe that oppreſſed his ſoul: Juſt as the whole of Chriſt's moſt holy obedience is imputed to us for righteouſneſs, though he gave an eminent demonſtration of it, when he was obedient to his Father *to the death, even the death of the croſs;* which conſiſted in a voluntary ſubmiſſion of ſoul, rather than in a motion of the members of the body, directed by his holy ſoul. Which we prove from ſcripture in this manner.

IV. 1. When the ſcripture ſpeaks of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, it aſcribes it to the ſufferings of Chriſt in general; as If. liii. 4. *Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our ſorrows;* that is, he hath ſuffered all the pains and ſorrows due to us for ſin: and that not only for our good, but in our ſtead. For, ver. 5. *he was wounded for our tranſgreſſions, he was bruiſed for our iniquities;* ſo that theſe ſins were the meritorious cauſe of the griefs and anguiſh of Chriſt; becauſe the Lord HIPHGINGA BO *made them to light or ruſh upon him*, ver. 6. and for theſe *he was afflicted*, ver. 7. when *the iniquity* of us all NIGGAS *was exacted* by God, as Judge and Avenger. But that affliction even then lay upon him, and our iniquity was exacted of him, when he was *brought as a lamb to the ſlaughter, and as a ſheep before her ſhearers, was dumb:* which certainly happened before the three hours of darkneſs, ver. 7. He therefore

gives too great ſcope to his fancy, who reſtrains the things which are affirmed of the afflictions, griefs, and anguiſh of Chriſt in general, to the three hours ſufferings.

V. Add what the Apoſtle writes, Heb. ii. 10. *It became him, to make the captain of their ſalvation perfect* (to conſecrate) *through ſufferings.* So that thoſe ſufferings, which Chriſt endured (and who ſhall pretend to except any, the apoſtle ſpeaking in ſuch general terms?) were requiſite, in order to Chriſt's being a perfect Saviour to us, and a ſacrifice conſecrated and acceptable to God: for this the TELEIOSIS or *perfecting* of Chriſt ſignifies; the performing of all thoſe things, to which he bound himſelf by his ſuretiſhip, and eſpecially of thoſe required to the full accompliſhment of his ſacerdotal expiation. And the apoſtle generally applies the ſufferings of Chriſt to this perfecting or conſecrating. Whence Chryſoſtom concludes well: "Wherefore the ſufferings are the perfecting and the cauſe of ſalvation." Nay, the ſacred writer had here in view all thoſe ſufferings, *by which he learned obedience;* for *being made perfect by them, he became the author of eternal ſalvation unto all them that obey him.** But he learned obedience not only by his three hours ſuffering, but in general by all his ſuffering; from which he learned and experienced the full extent of that obedience, to which he voluntarily ſubmitted: nay, indeed he principally learned obedience from his foregoing ſufferings, by which, as by certain principles, he was trained up to undergo thoſe that were extremely painful. And thus the cauſe of our ſalvation is aſcribed to all the ſufferings which Chriſt endured in the days of his fleſh.

* Heb. v. 8, 9.

VI. In like manner ſpeaks Peter,* *Chriſt* EPATHEN HUPER HUMON, *ſuffered for us. To ſuffer* here denotes to be in affliction; for all thoſe ſufferings are here intended, in which Chriſt has left us an example of patience. Theſe ſufferings he affirms to be *for us*, that is, undergone as well in *our ſtead*, as for *our good*. For this is ordinarily the ſignification of the word HUPER: as in *Euripides* in *Alceſte*, ME THNESCH' HUPER TOU D' ANDROS, OU D' EGO PRO SOU, "Die not for this man, as little ſhall I for thee;" which is to be underſtood in no other ſenſe, but that of ſubſtitution; as the ſubject of the tragedy, exhibiting the wife dying in the room of her huſband, plainly ſhews. In the ſame manner, Demoſthenes *in Corona*, ſays, EROTESON TOUTOUS, MALLON DE EGO TOUTH' HUPER SOU POIESO, "Aſk theſe, or rather I ſhall do it for you." And that this is the true meaning of Peter, we conclude hence, that in chap. iii. 18. he ſays, Chriſt ſuffered *for ſins*; namely, that he might be *the propitiation for our ſins*, 1 John iv. 10. But the ſufferings which Chriſt underwent in our room, I imagine may be ſaid to be ſatisfactory.

VII. In fine, as *the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh*, conſiſting in the ſorrowful and contemptible condition of Chriſt, runs parallel with the whole courſe of his life, and he took it upon him *for ſin*; ſo that God did therefore *condemn ſin*, and declare it had no manner of right over believers, either to condemn them, or reign over them;† it is manifeſt, that the ſcripture aſcribes the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to the whole of his humiliation; conſequently they don't take the ſcriptures for their guide, who confine it to the ſufferings only of thoſe three hours.

* 1 Pet. ii. 21. † Rom. viii. 3.

VIII. 2. The ſcripture ſo expreſsly declares, that Chriſt's death, even his corporal death, is to be eſteemed a part of his ſatisfaction, that it is aſtoniſhing how any one can deny it. Thus Iſ. liii. 10. *When thou ſhalt make his ſoul* (when his ſoul ſhall make itſelf) ASHAM *an offering for ſin;* which Chriſt himſelf* calls, *to give his life a ranſom for many;* and he ſays,† *I lay down my life for the ſheep.* Now *to give his life*, is to die a corporal death, which the reſurrection puts an end to. For thus Chriſt explains it,‡ *I lay down my life, that I may take it again.* And John ſays,§ when deſcribing the corporal death of Chriſt, *he gave up the ghoſt.* The argument will ſtill be ſtronger, if we conſider, that here is a manifeſt alluſion to that typical ſatisfaction, which was effected by ſhedding the blood of the victim, ſo ſeparated from the body as to be accompanied with death. But the blood is given for the life. Therefore a true ſatisfaction was made by the ſeparation of the ſoul from the body of Chriſt, in order to keep up the reſemblance between the type and the antitype.

IX. Add what Paul writes, Heb. x. 20. that *Chriſt hath conſecrated for us a new and living way to the heavenly ſanctuary, through the vail, that is to ſay, his fleſh.* The fleſh of Chriſt was doubtleſs the vail, which hindered our acceſs. For while it ſtill continued entire, it was an indication that ſin was not yet aboliſhed, nor the curſe removed. It was therefore neceſſary, that the vail, that is, the fleſh, of Chriſt, ſhould be rent; which was done, when the ſpirit quitted the fleſh: for then the body ceaſed to be a ſyſtem of organs, and became a heap of duſty particles, ſoon to return to duſt, unleſs its reſurrection ſhould be haſtened. And thus a new way was conſecrated for us, that is, complete liberty

* Matth. xx. 28. † John x. 15. ‡ Ver. 17. § Chap. xix. 30.

purchaſed, and full right to the heavenly ſanctuary. Which was ſignified and ſealed by that rending of the vail in the temple, which happened at the very inſtant of Chriſt's death.* Hence the body of Chriſt is ſaid to be *broken for us*.† It is not improperly obſerved by the learned perſon, that, upon ſhedding the blood of the ſacrifice, expiation was made, which was afterwards to be preſented to God by bringing the blood into the holy of holies. But I wiſh he would conſider, what I have juſt hinted, that the ſeparation of the ſoul of Chriſt from the body anſwered to the ſhedding of the blood, which is the rending of the vail, and breaking of the body; as the bringing the ſoul into heaven, to preſent to God the ſatisfaction made by death, anſwers to the introduction of the blood into the holy of holies.

X. And what is more evident than that paſſage of Peter,‡ that *Chriſt hath ſuffered once for ſins, being put to death in the fleſh*, that is, in the body? where the death of the body is ſet forth as a part of thoſe ſufferings, which Chriſt endured for ſins. Add Col. i. 21, 22. *He hath reconciled you in the body of his fleſh through death.* Rom. v. 10. *We were reconciled to God by the death of his Son.* Heb. ix. 15. *That by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt teſtament, they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.* And what death does Paul here mean? Doubtleſs that which muſt intervene for the confirmation of the teſtament, ver. 16, 17. which certainly is the death of the body: *Who is he that condemneth? It is Chriſt that died.*§ To explain all this in ſuch a manner, as by death not to underſtand what in every language the death of a man ſignifies, namely, the ſeparation of ſoul and body, is harſh and unreaſonable.

* Matth. xxvii. 51. † 1 Cor. xi. 24. ‡ 1 Pet. iii. 18.
§ Rom. viii. 34.

XI. 3. Beſides, both Iſaiah* and Peter† affirm, that our healing is, in a more ſpecial manner, owing to the ſtripes of Chriſt, as a part of his ſufferings, while they ſay, *By [with] his ſtripes we are healed.* For by that cruel ſcourging, whereby the whole body of the Lord Jeſus was ſo mangled, as in a manner to become one continued ſtripe, together with his other ſufferings, he merited, that we ſhould be delivered from the buffetings of Satan, and the ſtrokes of divine vengeance. And further, when we contemplate the ſufferings of Chriſt, and, among them, that cruel ſcourging, whereby the Lord Jeſus was made a ſpectacle to men and angels, we then underſtand, what the holineſs of God is, what is due to God, in order to the remiſſion of ſins, what the ſinner muſt undergo, if he would make ſatisfaction to God and to his holineſs, what a dreadful thing ſin is, and how much, in fine, we are indebted to Chriſt, for enduring ſo much for us. And this healing from ſin is ours, if we dread the wrath of God, are in love with his holineſs, and make returns of love to Chriſt. And thus it appears, though we ſay we are healed by the ſtripes of Chriſt, as by an example; yet there is in the ſcourging of Chriſt, *a demonſtration of the juſtice of God*, that we may know it; and, by knowing it with due affection, be reſtored to the likeneſs of God. In theſe ſtripes there is MUSAR SHELOMENU, *an exemplary puniſhment bringing peace to us*: as we lately ſhewed, to be the import of that word.

XII. 4. Nothing can appear more abſurd than to exclude from the ſatisfactory ſufferings of Chriſt, by way of eminence, that ſorrow of his ſoul, that great trouble and heavineſs, that horror and amazement, that exceeding great ſorrow, even unto death, thoſe clots of

* Iſ. liii. 5. † 1 Pet. ii. 24.

bloody ſweat, thoſe prayers and ſupplications, with tears and ſtrong cries, the reſult of theſe agonies, all which the Holy Ghoſt ſo circumſtantially deſcribes. This great trouble and agony did not ariſe only from the ſympathy of the ſoul with the body, nor from the mere horror of impending death: it was ſomething elſe, that afflicted the ſoul of Chriſt; namely, his bearing the ſins, not of one man, but of all the elect: he beheld the awful tribunal of God, before which he was preſently to be ſiſted, in order to pay what he took not away: he ſaw the Judge himſelf armed with his incomprehenſible vengeance, the law brandiſhing all the thunders of its curſes, the devil and all the powers of darkneſs, with all the gates of hell, juſt ready to pour in upon him; in a word, he ſaw juſtice itſelf inexorable and moſt rigid, to which he was bound to make full ſatisfaction even to the laſt farthing: he ſaw the face of his deareſt Father not now ſmiling with a ſingle ray of favor, nay rather burning with the terrible heat of all wrath againſt the ſins of mankind, which he had undertaken to atone for. And whitherſoever he turned, not the leaſt glimpſe of relief appeared for him, either in heaven or on earth, till with reſolution and conſtancy he had acquitted himſelf in the combat. Theſe, theſe are the things, which, not without reaſon, ſtruck Chriſt with terror and amazement, and forced from him groans, ſighs, and tears. And if all theſe things were not expiatory and ſatisfactory for our ſins, what reaſon ſhall we aſſign, why the other ſufferings of Chriſt in the three hours of darkneſs, ſhould be accounted ſatisfactory?

XIII. He certainly thinks too meanly of them, who affirms, that thoſe horrors, and this anguiſh, were, in compariſon of the more grievous tortures which Chriſt endured on the croſs itſelf, to be deemed only an *ante-paſſion*, or a kind of prelibation or foretaſte. But nei-

ther do the ſcriptures, which repreſent theſe things with ſuch a flow of words, nor our expoſitors on Heb. v. 7. ſpeak in this manner, though one of them perverts their words to that purpoſe. And it would be difficult to point out, what the ſoul of Chriſt endured on the croſs itſelf, which could ſo vaſtly exceed theſe horrors. Then he complained of ſorrow, now he was not ſilent; there he bore the curſe due to us, now he almoſt ſunk under it; there he complained of being forſaken of his Father, now he almoſt fainted away on taking the moſt bitter cup of wrath: nay, greater ſigns of conſternation could ſcarce be obſerved on the croſs, than what appeared here. We ſhall preſently reply to what we read about the comforting angel. It muſt indeed have been an exceeding great diſtreſs, at the firſt onſet of which, reſolution and conſtancy itſelf began to *be amazed, in heavineſs, and exceeding ſorrowful even unto death*; that made him offer prayers and ſupplications, with ſtrong cries and tears, to him who could preſerve him from death; that made him ſtruggle with ſo much agony, as rendered the appearance of a comforting angel neceſſary, and made the ſweat trickle down his body, like clots of blood falling to the ground. This diſcovered ſuch a commotion of the ſpirits and blood, as we ſcarce, if ever, meet with a ſimilar inſtance in hiſtory. Let us therefore beware, that we take not upon us, with too much confidence, to determine, what ſufferings of Chriſt, and in what degree, ſome were more grievous than others. Let us rather ſet on each their due price, and acknowledge the ſatisfactory value of them all. This is far more ſuitable to the glory of Chriſt, and to the ſincerity of our faith.

XIV. 5. And laſtly, Chriſt endured all thoſe ſufferings, either *as a Surety*, or in ſome other reſpect. If as

a Surety, we gain our purpoſe; for he engaged to ſatisfy divine juſtice, not only for our good, but in our room, by undergoing the puniſhment of our ſins, the guilt of which he had voluntarily taken upon himſelf. This is a fundamental point among the orthodox: nor will the learned perſon, whoſe opinion we have taken in pieces, deny it. If we lay aſide a ſuretiſhip, Chriſt can be no otherwiſe conſidered than as innocent and perfectly holy. But it does not ſeem to be very conſiſtent with the juſtice of God, that an innocent perſon, as ſuch, ſhould be puniſhed, and that to the ſhedding of his blood, to cruel and inexpreſſible agony of ſoul, in a word, to death itſelf. Or, ſhould God, at any time, be pleaſed to expoſe an innocent creature to ſuch dreadful tortures, in order to ſhew his inconteſtible authority over all; it is not likely, he would chuſe to give ſuch a proof of that ſupreme authority in the perſon of his only beloved Son, who fully acknowledges the right or authority of the Father. And then, of what uſe were thoſe ſufferings of Chriſt, if they were not undergone in our room? Was it in order to confirm his doctrine? or to give a pattern of patience, and ſhew us the way, by which thro' ſtraits and difficulties, we might reach to things noble and divine? Or was it that, being made a merciful High Prieſt, he might readily afford aſſiſtance to the tempted? Or was it to fulfil the truth of the prophecies, and anſwer the ſignification of the types? But there is none of theſe particulars which, the blaſphemous Socinus, with his followers will not eaſily admit. And if we here ſtop ſhort, we ſhall allow no greater value to theſe ſufferings of Chriſt, than theſe worſt perverters of our religion, and of the hope and conſolation of believers, have done.

XV. But the very learned perſon takes a far different courſe, whoſe obſervations, which lately came to my hand on account of their late publication, deſerve a par-

ticular hearing. Seeing the finner man, fays he, was, according to what God had threatened, become liable unto death, till he had fatisfied divine juftice,* and was brought into that condition by the devil, who had conquered man, and thereby was become his lord,† under whofe dominion and captivity man afterwards lived; in order to deliver, and perfectly reftore him, it was neceffary, becaufe he could do neither of thefe things himfelf, both that another *fhould undergo* and conquer *for him the death which he deferved*, and that another *fhould refcue him from the power of the devil*, who was refcued from him by violence and military prowefs. The former requires *a Surety*, who, taking guilt upon himfelf in man's name, fhould willingly and patiently undergo the juft penalty at the hands of the moft righteous Judge, to his full fatisfaction. The latter calls for a *Redeemer or Avenger*, who, by a juft claim, may refcue flaves out of the hands of an unjuft tyrant (fuch as he who, by fraud and violence, acquires a dominion) and, by oppofition and refiftance, injures the innocent. To both thefe purpofes God appointed his own Son, whom, by an eternal covenant, he chofe to the mediatorial office; and revealed in his word, that he fhould be *the valiant conqueror* of the ferpent, and *the deliverer* of fome men,‡ alfo, *a vicarious Surety*, and afterwards *a facrifice*, which was pointed out by clothing our firft parents with fkins.§ The fufferings of Chrift therefore are of two forts: One *judicial*, which he endured as *Surety*, juftly on the part of God, for the debts of others, which he had undertaken to pay, and which being done, a reconciliation is the confequence: the other, *warlike*, which he endured as *Deliverer* [or Redeemer] unjuftly brought on him by his enemies, Satan and his inftru-

* Gen. ii. 17. † 2 Pet. ii. 19. ‡ Gen. iii. 15. § Ver. 21.

ments, becauſe he will bring to ſalvation thoſe whom he redeemed by his ranſom. Both theſe kinds of ſufferings belong to *the perfecting* of Chriſt.

XVI. In this diſcourſe of the very learned perſon, every thing ſavours of learning, much alſo is genuine and ſolid; which I heartily approve. For it is certain, that Chriſt is not only our Surety, but alſo our Deliverer; what merits our conſideration in this queſtion is only this, whether, when Chriſt, by his *judicial* ſufferings as *Surety*, fully ſatisfied divine juſtice, other ſufferings are alſo requiſite, by which, as *Redeemer*, he might overcome Satan, and bring the redeemed to heaven by his ranſom. To me the matter appears in this light: As all the ſufferings of men ariſe from the demerit of their ſins, no matter whether immediately inflicted by God, or by means of Satan and his inſtruments;* ſo, in like manner, all the ſufferings of Chriſt aroſe from the demerit of our ſins; for which when he had ſatisfied divine juſtice, he merited for his own deliverance, not only from the wrath of God, but alſo from the tyranny of the devil; from which that he may deliver his redeemed ones, there is no occaſion for ſufferings of another kind, but only for his power and authority. It is ſufficient for this, that he is *the mighty God*,† *the mighty one of Jacob*,‡ *ſtronger than the ſtrong man*.§ I own Chriſt had to ſtruggle with the devil, which he could not do without ſufferings: but even this very thing was owing to the demerit of our ſins. For when God by a juſt ſentence delivered up to the tyranny of Satan, man who had ſuffered himſelf to be overcome by the devil; it was neceſſary that Chriſt, as man's Surety, ſhould be expoſed to the haraſſment of the devil, that, in that reſpect alſo, he might ſatisfy divine juſtice: nor

* Jer. ii. 15, 16, 17. † Iſ. ix. 6. ‡ Iſ. lx. 16.
§ Luke xi. 21, 22.

could the devil or his inſtruments ever have had any power to give vexation to Chriſt, if he had not, being loaded with the guilt of our crimes, been expoſed by God the moſt righteous Judge to injuries from them.* But we are to ſpeak more at large of this preſently.

XVII. And thus we are now come to the examination of thoſe diſtinctions, by which the learned perſon explains and maintains his cauſe: namely, he diſtinguiſhes between *compenſating* and *convincing puniſhments*, between *judicial* and *warlike ſufferings*. The meaning of theſe diſtinctions, if I rightly take them, is this. Compenſating puniſhment is that, whereby ſatisfaction is made to divine juſtice, of which Rom. ii. 5, 6, 8, 9. and called *the wrath to come*. Matth. iii. 7. 1 Theſſ. i. 10. *Convincing puniſhment* is that, which is only inflicted, in order thereby to convince man of his ſin, yet ſo that, by undergoing it, no ſatisfaction is made to divine juſtice, nor any guilt removed, but it ſtill remains to be further avenged. Such puniſhments the ſcripture calls UBETHOCCHOTH HEMA *convictions of wrath* [*furious rebukes.*†] Of theſe it is ſaid,‡ OCHICHACHA, *I will convince* [*reprove*] *thee, and ſet them in order before thine eyes*. *Judiciary ſufferings* are thoſe which are inflicted by God, as a ſevere impartial judge, for a compenſation to his juſtice, in which there is wrath; and thus they are the ſame with compenſating puniſhments. *Warlike ſufferings* are thoſe, to which Chriſt was expoſed, when conflicting with the devil, who perſecuted him immediately upon his birth by means of Herod, afterwards tempted him in the wilderneſs, and many ways reviled and maltreated him by the enraged miniſters of his malice, according to what God ſays,§ *I will put enmity*, &c. In theſe, with reſpect to Chriſt,

* Acts ii. 23. † Ezek. v. 15. ‡ Pſal. l. 21. § Gen. iii. 15.

there was no wrath of God; but it rather tended to grace and glory, as when one ſuffers for righteouſneſs ſake.*

XVIII. To this we reply as follows: There can be no doubt, but a diſtinction is to be made between the ſore calamities, whereby God brings his elect and believers to the knowledge and ſenſe of their ſins, which ſpring from love, and are called *fatherly chaſtiſements*;† and the heavy calamities, which are inflicted on the wicked, who are under the wrath and curſe of God. But of theſe puniſhments of the wicked, to ſuppoſe ſome only convincing, and others compenſating, is neither authoriſed by ſcripture, nor countenanced by reaſon.

XIX. The ſcripture, indeed, makes mention of *the wrath to come*, which, doubtleſs, is compenſating; but it alſo frequently ſpeaks of a preſent wrath and curſe; Pſal. lvi. 8. & lix. 25. compare 2 Theſſ. ii. 16. John iii. 36. *The wrath of God abideth on him.* Wherefore unregenerate ſinners are called‡ TEKNA ORGES, *children of wrath*, not only becauſe they are liable to the wrath to come, but alſo on account of the wrath and curſe of God actually hanging over them, while they are not tranſlated into the kingdom of the Son of his love. *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven againſt all ungodlineſs and unrighteouſneſs of men.*§ Which wrath of God againſt the wicked, being very different from that, with which he is ſaid to be angry againſt the ſins of his own children, no reaſon can be aſſigned, why it may not be deemed compenſating, ſince it is the beginning of the eternal curſe, from which it differs not in eſſence, but in degree.

* 1 Pet. iv. 14. † Heb. xii. 6. ‡ Eph. ii. 3. § Rom. i. 18.

XX. Add, that this preſent wrath is *a judiciary puniſhment*, inflicted by the righteous ſentence of God on the wicked. The obſtinate unbeliever EDE KEKRITAI, *is condemned already*,* God taking puniſhment on the wicked in this life, *executes* SHEPHATIM BEAPH UBECHEMA judgments *in anger, and in fury*.† As in Egypt, he executed SHEPHATIM GEDOLIM *great judgments*.‡ That all may know, ÆLOHIM SHOPHTIM BAARÆTZ, that *he is a God that* JUDGETH *in the earth*.§ But why may not a judiciary puniſhment be alſo deemed compenſating?

XXI. And then thoſe puniſhments of the wicked, which the ſcripture calls THOCCHOTH, *rebukes*, are ſometimes ſo deſcribed, that they muſt be compenſating. For what elſe is a compenſating puniſhment, but the vengeance which an offended God takes on thoſe that deſpiſe him, in order to manifeſt his hatred againſt them? Now, all this is contained in thoſe convincing rebukes, which the Lord denounces againſt the Philiſtines: *And I will execute great* VENGEANCE *upon them with* FURIOUS REBUKES [rebukes of great anger;] *and they ſhall know that I am the Lord, when I ſhall lay my vengeance upon them*.‖

XXII. Convincing or rebuking puniſhments are alſo no leſs compenſating. Who ſhall deny that it is a compenſating puniſhment, when God conſumes the wicked in his fury? For that in the higheſt degree convinces them of their guilt. *Conſume them in wrath, conſume them, that they may not be; and let them know that God ruleth in Jacob, unto the ends of the earth*.¶ And ſurely nothing can convince the wicked more of the hainouſneſs of their ſins, than a puniſhment heightened to the greateſt degree, and in which there is a moſt evident

* John iii. 18. † Ezek. v. 15. ‡ Exod. vi. 6. & vii. 4.
§ Pſal. lviii. 11. ‖ Ezek. xxv. 17. ¶ Pſal. lix. 13.

demonſtration of the wrath of God, ſuch as a compenſating puniſhment is. Juſtly therefore we reject that diſtinction, which has not any foundation in ſcripture, and whoſe parts are contrary to the rules of ſound logic.

XXIII. Moreover, though we ſhould admit that diſtinction, how is it applicable to the ſufferings of Chriſt? Here, I own, I do not fully underſtand the learned author's meaning. To what purpoſe is this diſtinction of convincing and compenſating puniſhments? Is it, that as the puniſhments which the wicked endure in this life, are only convincing; and a compenſating puniſhment will at length be inflicted, in the day of wrath and judgment; ſo alſo the ſufferings, which Chriſt underwent during the whole time of his life, anſwer to thoſe convincing puniſhments, and the three hours ſufferings to the compenſating puniſhment? But what neceſſity exacted convincing puniſhments of Chriſt, ſeeing he both perfectly owned, and voluntarily confeſſed, the guilt of thoſe ſins he had taken upon him, and moſt willingly performed every thing by which he might expiate that guilt? Was it perhaps with this view, that, from a ſight of the ſufferings of Chriſt, believers might be convinced of their ſins? But that cannot be done more effectually, than when they conſider them as puniſhments due to their ſins, and ſo as a ſatisfaction for them. As therefore no puniſhments of Chriſt can be ſaid to be merely convincing, it remains, that all of them are compenſating or ſatisfactory; which is what we contend for.

XXIV. The diſtinction between *judiciary* and *warlike ſufferings* is no leſs impertinent. For Chriſt incurred no ſufferings but by the ſentence of God the Judge. When Chriſt *was afflicted, the iniquity of us all* NIGGAS *was exacted.** But that was the exaction of the Judge. When Satan, with his infernal powers, aſſaulted Chriſt,

* Iſ. liii. 7.

then was *the power of darkneſs*.* A determinate ſentence was granted by God to the prince of darkneſs to haraſs Chriſt. And Chriſt girding himſelf for that conflict, had in view that ſentence, or *commandment* of God, as he himſelf ſpeaks.†

XXV. What elſe is that very word of God, from which the original of the warlike ſufferings is derived, than the ſentence of God the Judge, againſt the ſerpent, who was to be deſtroyed by Chriſt, and againſt Chriſt as to his human nature, in which he trod the earth, who was to be haraſſed and ſlain by the ſerpent? I would fain know, if what is foretold concerning the bruiſing of his heel, does not alſo compriſe thoſe ſufferings of Chriſt, which are judiciary. If not, the firſt goſpel-promiſe does not explain the method of obtaining ſalvation by the ſatisfaction of a Mediator: and we are ordered to believe, that the words ſignify leſs than they can, or it is proper that they ſhould, if, as they ſuppoſe, they contain an enigmatical ſummary of things to be believed. But if, as is certainly right, we allow, that the ſatisfactory ſufferings of Chriſt are comprehended in theſe words, that new diſtinction is very improperly built upon them.

XXVI. Let us dwell a little longer on this meditation. Whatever power the devil has to haraſs wicked men, before he drag them to eternal death, he has it by the righteous ſentence of God the Judge, which Peter has expreſſed.‡ The elect themſelves, as ſinners, were alſo ſubject to that power; and, on that account, are ſaid to be not only *the prey of the mighty*, but likewiſe of *the lawful one*,§ he having a right over them by the ſentence of the ſupreme Judge. Jeſus the Surety came

* Luke xxii. 53. † John xiv. 31. ‡ 2 Pet. ii. 19. § Iſ. xlix. 24.

in their room, who therefore, in virtue of the same sentence, became subject to the buffetings of Satan. And by this means all the sufferings inflicted on him by the devil, were in the most proper sense judiciary.

XXVII. Nor is it any objection to this truth, that those conflicts with Satan proved glorious to Christ, as having endured them, because of the justice, and for advancing the glory of God. For all Christ's sufferings, even those which, according to this new hypothesis, we shall call judiciary, if the cause and event be considered, were highly glorious to him. He never more gloriously displayed his love to God and man, he never undertook a more excellent work, which the whole choir of angels beheld with greater applause, and God the Father himself was never more pleased with it, than when, hanging on the cross, he resolutely struggled with the horrors of eternal death. But if that be considered as an evil, which is contrary to nature, earnestly bent upon its own advantage; certainly, in these harrassings of Satan, there was the wrath of God against sin, which Christ had taken upon himself.

XXVIII. What too should hinder those sufferings, which, according to this hypothesis, are judiciary, to be called warlike? For who will deny, that Christ, when hanging on the cross, was, as it were, wrestling with the infernal powers, and the horrors of eternal death? Indeed, Paul testifies, that Christ had then *made openly a shew of principalities and powers, triumphing over them on the cross.** But who can refuse, that there was first a conflict before such a noble triumph and victory? From all these things we conclude, that the distinction of punishments into convincing and compensating, and of sufferings into warlike and judiciary, is unscriptural, antiscriptural, and irrational.

* Col. ii. 15.

XXIX. Let us now come to the arguments of the oppoſite ſide, as far as we have had acceſs to know them. Some of them are general againſt all the ſufferings of Chriſt, and others more ſpecial againſt ſome parts of his ſufferings. The general ones are partly taken from ſcripture, partly from the apoſtles creed, and partly from the catechiſm.

XXX. From ſcripture they thus argue: 1. That *the ſin of the whole earth ſhall be removed in one day*, according to Zech. iii. 9. And Paul ſeveral times affirms, that *the one offering* of Chriſt, *once made on the croſs*, was that expiatory ſacrifice, by which all the elect are perfected;* and therefore the preceding ſufferings of Chriſt were not ſatisfactory. 2. Further, that Chriſt, from the beginning of his life, was neither a prieſt, who could offer an expiatory ſacrifice, nor a ſacrifice which could be offered. Not a prieſt, becauſe he could not lawfully be one before the thirtieth year of his age: not a ſacrifice, as a lamb could not be ſuch before the ſeventh day. But the truth of the types ought to appear in Chriſt. 3. Add, that Chriſt thro' the whole of his life, except for a few hours, was in the favor of God; *increaſed in favor with God*;† was acknowledged to be the beloved Son of God;‡ was glorified in the mount;§ *rejoiced in ſpirit*.‖ But at the time in which he was in the favor of God, and rejoiced, he did not bear the wrath of God.

XXXI. From the *Creed* it is obſerved, that profeſſing our faith concerning the ſatisfactory ſufferings of Chriſt, we do not barely ſay, that he ſuffered, but that *he ſuffered under Pontius Pilate*; words never to be diſjoined, to teach us, that only thoſe ſufferings were ſatisfactory, which he endured under Pilate.

* Heb. ix. 28. & x. 10, 12, 14. † Luke ii. 52. ‡ Matth. iii. 17. § Matth. xvii. 2. ‖ Luke x. 21.

XXXII. From the [Heidelberg] catechiſm are quoted queſtions 31, 67, 70, 75, 80. where the impetration of our ſalvation is referred to the one offering of Chriſt, once made on the croſs. But as to what is alledged to the contrary from queſt. 37. where it is ſaid, that "for THE WHOLE TIME OF HIS LIFE which he lived upon earth, eſpecially at the end thereof, he ſuſtained the wrath of God againſt the ſin of all mankind, both in body and ſoul;" they anſwer, that to ſuſtain the wrath of God there, cannot ſignify, to feel the wrath of God, but to be bound to endure it. They illuſtrate and prove this explication by queſt. 84. where it is declared, concerning unbelievers and hypocrites, that "the wrath of God and eternal damnation do lie on them ſo long as they go on in their ſins:" which cannot be underſtood of a compenſating puniſhment unleſs we would ſuppoſe, that the wicked, by ſuffering on earth, make ſatisfaction to divine juſtice, which is abſurd. It therefore follows, that we explain this of their being obnoxious to divine wrath and eternal damnation. As, in the ſame ſenſe, our Lord declares, *He that believeth not the Son, the wrath of God abideth on him*,* that is, he is obnoxious to wrath.

XXXIII. To theſe arguments we humbly reply as follows. To the *firſt* we ſay, that all Chriſt's ſufferings together, ought to be deemed one full accompliſhment of the ſacerdotal office, which our Lord undertook, in order to expiate our ſins; which at laſt was fully completed, when Chriſt, dying on the croſs, offered himſelf to the Father for a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour: then the utmoſt farthing was paid: which being done, God declared, he was ſatisfied to the full, and on that day he blotted out the ſins of the whole earth, and expunged

* John iii. 36.

them from his book. From whence it cannot be inferred, that the preceding ſufferings of Chriſt were not ſatisfactory; but that then only the ſatisfaction was completed; of which completion this was the fruit, that on that very day the ſins of all the elect were blotted out. And this is the mind of God in Zechariah. But what Paul ſo often ſpeaks of the one offering, by which we are perfected, is to be underſtood in the ſame ſenſe; namely, ſince the ſufferings of Chriſt, when hanging on the croſs, were the moſt grievous, and the complement of the whole, therefore the ſcripture commonly aſcribes the expiation of our ſins to the croſs of Chriſt; becauſe, without that, his foregoing ſufferings had not been ſufficient; as the payment of the utmoſt farthing completes the ſatisfaction, which is immediately followed by tearing the hand-writing, and giving a diſcharge.

XXXIV. To the *ſecond* we reply: That here many things are aſſerted, which we can by no means yield to. 1. It is not true, that Chriſt was not a prieſt from the beginning of his life. For, from the beginning of his life, he was *the Chriſt*, that is, the Lord's anointed, no leſs to *the ſacerdotal* than to his other offices. And ſince, when lying in the manger, he was ſaluted *King* by the wiſe men, and, when twelve years old, he ſhewed himſelf a *Prophet* amidſt the doctors; who will, after all this, preſume to deprive him of the honor of his *prieſthood?* And as it belonged to the prieſts *to ſtand in the houſe of the Lord*,* was there not ſome diſplay of his ſacerdotal office in that apology to his parents, *Wiſt ye not that I muſt be about my Father's buſineſs?*† Nay, even before his incarnation, he exhibited ſome prelude of his prieſtly function by his interceſſion for the church.‡ We own indeed, that Chriſt was publicly inaugurated,

* Pſal. cxxxiv. 1. † Luke ii. 49. ‡ Zech. i. 12, 13.

in the thirtieth year of his age, to his mediatorial office: but we can no more infer from that, that Chriſt was not a Prieſt, than that he was not Mediator, before that time.

XXXV. I cannot but here ſubjoin the very ſolid reaſoning of the celebrated Cloppenburg:* "It could not be, but that, in the daily practice of piety, and the obedience due to God, which he performed in the days of his fleſh, Chriſt, who knew his unction from a child (as appears from Luke ii. 49.) ſhould offer prayers and ſupplications for the ſalvation of the church, whoſe King and Saviour he was born: compare Luke ii. 11. with Heb. vii. 5. And nothing hinders us to extend the words of the apoſtle to all the days of his fleſh, and all the ſufferings he endured from his infancy; becauſe by theſe he learned obedience: and ſo it was altogether the conſtant apprenticeſhip or noviciate of the mediatorial office of Chriſt, who walked from a child with God: wherein he from day to day fulfilled, by a perſevering obedience, the work which the Father had given him for the redemption of the church, which was to be fully completed by crowning his whole obedience with the offering up of himſelf a ſacrifice, when he ſhould be publicly called thereto, John xvii. 4. Acts ii. 23."

XXXVI. 2. Neither is it true, that Chriſt was not a ſacrifice from the beginning of his life. For though his offering was completed on the croſs, and by his death, yet he was even before that *the Lamb of God, that taketh away the ſin of the world.*† The iniquities of us all were laid upon him; and it was for no other cauſe, that he carried the form of a ſervant, and the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh, and, though he was rich, yet, for our ſakes, became poor; and in fine, was expoſed, from his very

* Ex. diſputat. de vita Chriſti privata, § 15, 16. † John i. 29.

infancy, to griefs, ſorrows, and perſecutions. All theſe calamities proceeded from this, that, as both prieſt and ſacrifice, he took our ſins upon himſelf, in order to their being at laſt wholly aboliſhed by his death.

XXXVII. 3. The proof of this paradoxical aſſertion, taken from the types of the Old Teſtament, is in many reſpects defective. For (1.) There is no ſolid foundation for that hypotheſis, that all the circumſtances of the types ought, in the ſame manner, to be found in the antitype. Otherwiſe it would follow, that Chriſt muſt have been ſlain at a year old, according to the type of the paſchal lamb. (2.) It is alſo a raſh aſſertion, that none could act as a prieſt before his thirtieth year. There is no ſuch command in the ſacred writings. The Levites, indeed, were, by the *Annal* law, not admitted to the noviciate before their twenty-fifth year,* nor before their thirtieth year, to the full exerciſe of their function.† "But indeed I find no where among the Rabbins," ſays Selden,‡ "that the years of the Levites, as Levites, indicated the legal age of the prieſts. And I very much wonder, great men ſhould admit of this, even while they ſharply criticiſe upon others." It is the conſtant tradition of the Hebrews, that a prieſt is fit for his office at his thirteenth year, after his years of puberty, though he is not bound to take his turn with the reſt, before his twentieth year. See Outram *de ſacrific. lib.* 1. *c.* 5. § 3. Joſephus relates of Ariſtobulus, "that when a young man, and out of his ſeventeenth year, he, by the law, aſcended the altar to officiate." 'Tis aſtoniſhing, the very learned perſon did not attend to theſe things, which, from his ſkill in the Hebrew ritual, he could not be ignorant of. (3.) If this argument is to be urged, it would thence follow, that Chriſt

* Numb. viii. 24. † Numb. iv. 3. ‡ De ſucceſſion. ad pontificat. Ebræor. lib. ii. c. 4.

could have been a ſacrifice after the ſeventh day from his birth, and immediately upon his thirtieth year, be a prieſt; which is contrary to what is ſuppoſed in the ſentiment we here oppoſe.

XXXVIII. To the *third*, we reply, 1. That the queſtion is not, whether Chriſt did, all his life long, ſo endure the wrath of God, as in the mean time to be favored with no conſolation, with no joy of the Spirit comforting him? None will affirm this. But the queſtion is, whether all thoſe ſufferings, which Chriſt at any time endured, and all that form of a ſervant which he aſſumed, belong to the perfection of his ſatisfaction? A thing that cannot be overthrown by ſome ſhining intervals of joy, now and then. 2. To be the beloved Son of God, and at the ſame time to ſuffer the wrath of God, are not ſuch contrary things, as that they cannot ſtand together. For, as Son, as the holy one, while obeying the Father in all things, he was always beloved; and indeed moſt of all, when obedient even to the death of the croſs: for that was ſo pleaſing to the Father, that, on account of it he raiſed him to the higheſt pitch of exaltation,* though, as charged with our ſins, he felt the wrath of God, burning, not againſt himſelf, but againſt our ſins, which he had taken upon himſelf. Who can doubt, that Chriſt, even hanging on the croſs, was in the higheſt love and favor of God, ſo far as he was Son, though at the ſame time he was made a curſe for our ſins? 3. It has never been proved, that it was a thing improper and inconſiſtent, for Chriſt to have ſome mitigation granted him, while he ſatisfied for our ſins, by means of ſome rays of conſolation, at intervals, ſhining in upon him, by which he might be animated reſolutely to acquit himſelf in the conflict. Nor is it credi-

* Phil. ii. 9.

ble, that he had always the ſenſation of divine wrath, or that it was always equally intenſe, even on the very croſs itſelf; or that he was as much preſſed down by his agonies, when he made a promiſe of paradiſe to the thief, and ſpoke ſo affectionately with his mother and John, as when he complained, that he was forſaken of God. See that kind addreſs of God the Father to Chriſt, when *he was deſpiſed by every one*, and *abhorred by the people, and a ſervant of rulers*.*

XXXIX. What is argued from the creed, ſcarce deſerves any anſwer. For when Chriſt is ſaid to have ſuffered under Pontius Pilate, nothing leſs is hinted than a diſtinction of the ſatisfactory ſufferings of Chriſt from thoſe which are not: a fiction, I imagine, that none ever thought of. But the time is ſimply indicated, in which Chriſt completed his ſufferings, and the perſon, by whoſe authority he was condemned to the croſs. Nor will the maintainer of this paradox affirm, that all the ſufferings, which Chriſt endured under Pilate, or by his authority, were ſatisfactory; ſince both the ſcourging, and thoſe indignities, which Chriſt ſuffered in the pretorium, and his condemnation, nay, his very crucifixion and death, muſt be excluded thence, if the ſatisfaction is to be reſtricted to the three hours of darkneſs.

XL. It is without doubt that violence is done the catechiſm, which refers the impetration of our ſalvation to the one offering of Chriſt, with no other deſign, than what Paul does, whoſe meaning I have already explained. The words of queſt. 37. appear to be perverted and miſinterpreted. 1. Becauſe it is an anſwer to this queſtion, "What believeſt thou, when thou ſayeſt, HE

* Iſ. xlix. 7.

SUFFERED?" Now, that expreſſion, *He ſuffered*, does not ſignify the bare ſuſception of guilt, but the enduring of ſorrows. 2. If *to endure the wrath of God* does not there ſignify to feel it, but only to take its guilt upon himſelf, it would follow, that even at the cloſe of his life he did not feel the wrath of God. For, in the ſame ſenſe, the catechiſm affirms that very thing of the whole of Chriſt's life, and of the cloſe thereof. 3. Urſinus is a more faithful interpreter of the catechiſm, when he writes, "Under the appellation of ſuffering, are underſtood, all the infirmities, miſeries, griefs, racking tortures of ſoul and body, to which, on our account, Chriſt was obnoxious, from his nativity to his laſt breath," *&c.* 4. 'Tis in vain to ſeek for any pretence to this forced ſenſe from queſt. 84. and John iii. 36. For it is not an obnoxiouſneſs to the wrath of God that alone hangs over unbelievers and hypocrites; but they are really in a ſtate of wrath and curſe; and that curſe, which they are now under, is the beginning and a part of thoſe pains, which they ſhall ſuffer for ever.

XLI. The more ſpecial arguments and exceptions, either regard the *death* of Chriſt, or his *agonies* in the garden, or are taken from the *beginning* and *end of the ſolar eclipſe*; which I ſhall ſet in ſuch a light, as at the ſame time to refute them.

XLII. If any ſhall ſay, that the ſcripture, when aſcribing our redemption to the death of Chriſt, means by that death thoſe very intenſe pains of eternal death, which Chriſt endured both in ſoul and body together, when he complained, that he was forſaken of his God; I anſwer, that indeed they are not, on any account, to be ſecluded from the compaſs of the word *death*; but that the death of Chriſt is not to be ſo confined to them, as to exclude the death of the body, or the ſeparation of

ſoul and body. For Peter ſpeaks expreſsly of the *death of the fleſh*,* and the whole ſcripture aſcribes our ranſom to that death, from which Chriſt aroſe by his reſurrection: and in fine, Paul makes the ſacrifice which Chriſt offered, to conſiſt in a death, which is like to that which is appointed for all men once to undergo,† and which‡ is a ſacrifice, and was ſhadowed forth by the ſlaying of the legal ſacrifices. And we have already mentioned ſeveral places, which cannot, without manifeſt violence, be ſo explained, as to exclude the death of the body from being included in his death.

XLIII. If you object, that Chriſt had before ſaid, *It is finiſhed;* I anſwer, it ought to be underſtood of his finiſhing all thoſe things, which he was to ſuffer and do in life, ſo that nothing remained, but to conclude the whole by a pious death. Juſt as Paul ſaid, *I have finiſhed my courſe;*§ and Chriſt himſelf, *I have finiſhed the work which thou gaveſt me to do.*‖ Whence one would abſurdly infer, that there remained for Chriſt, on ſaying this, nothing further to be done or ſuffered; when he was ſtill to be made perfect by his laſt ſufferings. The meaning is evident; namely, that Chriſt, in diſcharging his office, had perfectly performed all he was thus far to perform.

XLIV. If you inſiſt upon it, that his death was calm and gentle, without the appearance of any pains of eternal death, having already undergone theſe: I anſwer, it was a gentle death indeed, in ſo far as the faith of Chriſt, now victorious over all temptations, was well appriſed, that he had ſurmounted the greateſt pains, and was ſecure about his reſurrection and the promiſed reward; but yet he died a curſed death, inflicted by the wrath of God againſt ſin; and the curſe of it was typically figur-

* 1 Pet. iii. 18. † Heb. ix. 27. ‡ Ver. 26. § 2 Tim. iv. 7.
‖ John xvii. 4.

ed by his hanging on the tree, which ſtill continued in and after death. For, while he hung on the tree, ſo far he was doubtleſs under the curſe, according to Gal. iii. 13. By which is ſignified, that his puniſhment ought to be taken as holding forth guilt, and the curſe of God.

XLV. But, ſay you, believers are ſtill to die; and therefore Chriſt did not ſatisfy for them by his death. I anſwer, the catechumens have been taught to anſwer this objection from queſt. 42. of the Heidelberg catechiſm.* By the death of Chriſt, death hath ceaſed to be, what it was before, the puniſhment inflicted by an offended judge, and the entrance into the ſecond death, and is become the extermination of ſin, and the way to eternal life; and at the laſt day it ſhall be altogether aboliſhed. And if you go on to argue in this manner, I ſhall eaſily make it appear from your own hypotheſis, that even that very anguiſh of Chriſt, when he complained of his being forſaken of God, was not ſatisfactory for us; for believers themſelves often complain of ſpiritual deſertion: *But Zion ſaid*, NGADSABANI JEHOVAH, *The Lord hath forſaken me*, Iſ. xlix. 14. Where we have the very ſame word, which the Lord Jeſus uſes, Pſal. xxii. 2. And Zion ſays ſo truly, with reſpect to the ſenſe of grace, and the influence of ſpiritual conſolation. The difference between the deſertion, whereby Chriſt was forſaken of his Father, and that of believers, conſiſts in this, that, in the former, there was the wrath and curſe of God, and the *formal* nature of puniſhment, which are not in the latter; neither are theſe in their death.

* Q. But ſince Chriſt died for us, why muſt we alſo die? A. Our death is not a ſatisfaction for ſin, but the aboliſhing of ſin, and our paſſage into everlaſting life.

XLVI. As to what is objected to our argument, taken from the agonies of Chriſt in Gethſemane, it is pretended, that theſe ſufferings were not ſatisfactory in this very thing, that then an angel appeared to comfort him; whereas a good angel could not have done this, without a moſt grievous ſin againſt God, if Chriſt was then actually making ſatisfaction; eſpecially as he was to tread this wine-preſs alone, and it was foretold, that, while making ſatisfaction, he ſhould be deprived of all conſolation, *There is none to take pity, comforters I found none*:* this argument is very inconcluſive. For, 1. That angel did not tread the wine-preſs together with the Lord Jeſus; nor was any part of his ſufferings laid upon him; nor, by any natural influence, did he aſſiſt Chriſt in carrying that burden. He ſtrengthened Chriſt no otherwiſe than in a moral ſenſe, by ſetting before him the glorious iſſue of the conflict he had undertaken, and by other arguments to the like purpoſe. 2. There is no reaſon, why ſome ſmall ſhare of comfort ſhould not be adminiſtered to Chriſt, while in the act of making ſatisfaction; eſpecially if done with a view to preſerve him for more, and not fewer ſufferings. The words of Pſal. lxix. are not to be taken in ſuch a general ſenſe, as to exclude all manner of conſolation and pity: for *a great company of people and of women bewailed him*,† as did alſo *all the people that came together to that ſight, and ſmote upon their breaſts*,‡ and the beloved diſciple John, and above all his pious mother, *whoſe ſoul then a ſword pierced*.§ Nor is there any thing in the words of the pſalm, which obliges us to confine theſe things to the three hours darkneſs. It treats of that time, in which *they gave him gall for his meat, and in his thirſt gave him vinegar to drink*,‖ which was not

* Pſal. lxix. 20. † Luke xxiii. 27. ‡ Ver. 48. § Luke ii. 35. ‖ Ver. 21.

done during the darkneſs. 3. It cannot be inferred, that God the Father, in ſending that angel, had not then either aſſumed or then laid aſide the character of a ſtrict and impartial judge; any more than it can be inferred, that the minds of Chriſt's enemies were diſpoſed to pity, when they laid the croſs on Simon of Cyrene, in order that he might carry it after him. For both was done with a view, leſt Chriſt ſinking under his preſent pains, ſhould eſcape thoſe that were to enſue. 4. We ſhall by this be better able to form a judgment of the incredible load of anguiſh, with which that mighty Lion of the tribe of Judah was ſo preſſed down, that he appeared almoſt ready to ſink under it, unleſs he was, in ſome manner at leaſt, heartened. 5. Nor, on any pretence, can that angel be accuſed of any bad action, in ſtrengthening Chriſt, while ſatisfying for us; ſince, by that conſolation, he neither went about to rob Chriſt of his glory, to whom alone the praiſe of ſatisfying remains entire; nor to oppoſe the decree of God, to execute which with reſolution he animated Chriſt; nor to put any bar in the way of our ſalvation, to acquire the right to which by conſtancy in his ſufferings he encouraged the Lord.

XLVII. To pretend to infer from the beginning and end of the ſolar eclipſe, during the paſſion of Chriſt, the beginning and end of his ſatisfaction, is a cabbaliſtical fancy, founded neither on ſcripture, nor ſolid reaſon. I will not deny, that, in that darkneſs, there was a kind of type of the very thick darkneſs, with which the greatly-diſtreſſed ſoul of the Lord Jeſus was then overwhelmed, without a ſingle ray of conſolation breaking in upon him, but what his unſhaken faith, grounded on the inviolable promiſes of his Father, and not ſtaggering as to the certainty of the future reward, darted in at times upon his trembling ſoul. But the queſ-

tion is not, Whether Chriſt was then actually ſatisfying? this we all allow: the queſtion is, whether then only?

XLVIII. But let us now conclude this debate; which has ſo much diſquieted the mind of this very learned perſon, as his friends wanted the world ſhould know from letters, publiſhed after his death. But God and my conſcience are my witneſſes, that nothing but the love of truth, which is only to be derived from, and defended by the ſcriptures, obliged me to enter upon this ſubject. I know not in what I can be blamed, unleſs in the liberty I have taken to diſſent from the author. But if, by taking a wrong path, I have ſtrayed from the truth, how acceptable will the kind admonition be! How readily ſhall I own and correct the error! I heartily wiſh we could generally endeavour to pleaſe ourſelves leſs, in order to pleaſe God more. I ever had a veneration for this learned perſon, though, after our diſpute, I found he was much diſguſted. But I thought this ſhould be no hinderance to my profiting by his learned commentaries, which I own I did, with a juſt commendation of the author; as my other writings abundantly teſtify, I have done, and that very ſincerely.

CHAP. VII.

Of the Effect of Chriſt's Satisfaction.

THE *effect* of Chriſt's ſatisfaction is *twofold: The firſt* regards *Chriſt* himſelf; *the other, the elect.* Chriſt, by his ſatisfaction, obtained for *himſelf*, as Mediator, a right to all the elect: which the Father willingly and deſervedly beſtows upon him; *Aſk of me, and I ſhall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermoſt*

*parts of the earth for thy poſſeſſion.** This is Chriſt's PHENGULLATH, *work with his God, that he ſhould not only be his ſervant, to raiſe up the tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael; but that he ſhould be given for a light to the Gentiles, that he might be God's ſalvation unto the end of the earth.*† It appears alſo from that promiſe, *If his ſoul ſhall make itſelf an offering for ſin, he ſhall ſee his ſeed.*‡ And thus we become his *inheritance,*§ *his peculiar treaſure,*‖ *his peculiar people.*¶

II. Beſides, it is not poſſible, but Chriſt ſhould exerciſe that right, which he acquired at ſo dear a rate. When, according to the determinate counſel of the divine decree, the time of the gracious viſitation of every one of the elect is come, he actually delivers them, as his property by an out ſtretched arm. And why ſhould he not? Seeing he can eaſily effect it by the power of his Spirit, turning and inclining their heart. Is it credible, he ſhould ſuffer thoſe, who are his lawful right, to be, and to remain the ſlaves of Satan? Is it worthy of Chriſt, that he ſhould not be actually glorified in the ſanctification and happineſs of thoſe, for whom he underwent ſo much infamy? or ſhould ſuffer any of thoſe to periſh, whom he purchaſed for his own poſſeſſion by his precious blood? Chriſt himſelf hath taught us thus to reaſon: *And other ſheep I have, which are not of this fold; them alſo I muſt bring, and they ſhall hear my voice.*** Becauſe theſe ſheep were of right his property, it therefore became him actually to lay hold of them as his own, and bring them into his fold. Nor can the right of Chriſt be made ineffectual, or remain without actual poſſeſſion; eſpecially, as he was not promiſed by the Father a bare right, but alſo a poſſeſſion by right

* Pſal. ii. 8. † Iſ. xlix. 4, 6. ‡ Iſ. liii. 10. § Eph. i. 11. ‖ Pſ. cxxxv. 4. ¶ Tit. ii. 14. & 1 Pet. ii. 9. ** John x. 16.

upon his making satisfaction; as the places above quoted evince.

III. The Lord Jesus obtained for *the elect*, by his satisfaction, *an immunity from all misery*, and *a right to eternal life*, to be applied unto them in effectual calling, regeneration, sanctification, conservation, and glorification. This the scripture declares. Thus, *This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.** *He gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father.*† *Gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.*‡ *Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify it—that he might present it to himself a glorious church,*§ &c. In a word, *This is that faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.*‖ By these and many other like passages, which it would be needless to enumerate here, it evidently appears, that the effect of Christ's satisfaction was not a bare *possibility of the remission* of our sins, and of our reconciliation with God, but an actual *remission* and *reconciliation*, an abolition of the dominion of sin, and at length salvation itself: of which it is not possible the elect should have no share, unless Christ should be deemed to have satisfied the Father for them to no purpose. It is certainly incumbent on us, never to enervate the force of the words of the Holy Ghost; least of all in those places and expressions of scripture, where the subject of our salvation is delivered; nor to detract in any thing from the value of the satisfaction of our Lord.

* Matth. xxvi. 28. † Gal. i. 4. ‡ Tit. ii. 14. § Eph. v. 25, 26, 27. ‖ 1 Tim. i. 15.

IV. This truth alſo appears from thoſe places of ſcripture, in which the ſatisfaction of Chriſt is called APOLUTROSIS, *a redemption*, made by the payment of LUTRON, a ranſom, or ANTILUTRON, a price of redemption. For the proximate effect of redemption, and of the payment of a ranſom, is the ſetting the captive at liberty, not a bare poſſibility of liberty. It is neither cuſtomary, nor equitable, that, after paying the price, it ſhould ſtill remain uncertain, whether the captive is to be ſet free or not. A true redeemer procures the reſtitution of liberty to the miſerable captive, wherever good faith and an agreement are of force. One may poſſibly treat about the price, though uncertain of the event; but it is neither prudent or juſt, to make any payment, before what is ſtipulated be made ſure and firm. The ſcripture itſelf defines redemption ſo, that it makes the proximate effect of it to be the actual remiſſion of ſins, and our reſtoration to liberty. *We are juſtified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Chriſt Jeſus.** *In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveneſs of ſins, according to the riches of his grace.*† And Col. i. 14. is to the ſame purpoſe. In like manner, Heb. ix. 12. *By his own blood he obtained eternal redemption for us;* the fruit of which is eternal liberty and ſalvation.

V. Of the like nature are thoſe phraſes, by which the elect are ſaid to *be bought with a price, purchaſed with blood, redeemed by Chriſt's ſubjection to the law:* as 1 Cor. vi. 29. *Ye are bought with a price.* Acts xx. 28. *To feed the church of God, which he hath purchaſed with his own blood.* Gal. iv. 4. 5. *Made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law.* Now, whoever makes a purchaſe of any thing, has an unqueſtionable

* Rom. iii. 24. † Eph. i. 7.

right to it, and it not only may, but actually does become his property, in virtue of his purchase, upon paying down the price. And herein consists our liberty and salvation, that we are no longer our own, nor the property of sin, nor of Satan, but the property of Christ. Whence it appears, that the effect of Christ's satisfaction is not a bare possibility of our salvation, but salvation itself.

VI. A right to all the benefits of the covenant of grace is purchased at once to all the elect by the death of Christ, so far as that, consistently with the truth and justice of God, and with the covenant he entered into with his Son, he cannot condemn any of the elect, or exclude them from partaking in his salvation; nay, on the contrary, he has declared, that satisfaction being now made by his Son, and accepted by himself, there is nothing for the elect either to suffer or do, in order to acquire either exemption from punishment, or a right to life; but that it only remains, that each of them, in their own order and time, enjoy the right purchased for them by Christ, and the inheritance arising from it. And this is what the apostle says, *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.** That is, seeing God accepted of the offering of his Son, when he gave himself up to death for his people, he received, at the same time, into favor, not only the preserved of Israel, but also all nations, and all families of the earth, which in other respects, lay in wickedness, and were liable to the wrath of God, declaring that satisfaction was now made to him for their sins, and that these could no longer be imputed to them for condemnation, nor for excluding from his saving grace.

* 2 Cor. v. 19.

VII. To the same purpose is that, Zech. iii. 9. *For behold, the stone that I have laid before Joshua: upon one stone shall be seven eyes; behold, I will engrave the gravings thereof, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will remove the iniquity of that land in one day.* *The stone* here is doubtless the Lord Jesus Christ, as Dan. ii. 34. Psal. cxviii. 22. on which the church is built, and by which it is supported. It is *laid* before Joshua and his companions the priests, that, as architects, they may lay it for the foundation of faith, acknowledge it as the corner-stone, and build thereon both themselves and other believers. This stone is but *one: for other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ.** Upon this stone there are *seven eyes*, either of God the Father, viewing it with care and pleasure, or of the church universal, looking to it by faith. Its *gravings* engraved by God, represent those very clear indications or characters, by which he may and ought to be distinguished, as one given by the Father to be a Saviour; among which characters were those sufferings, by which he was to be made perfect. These things being done, to shew that all the signs of the Messiah were in him, God declares, that *he would remove the iniquity of all that land* (clearly signifying the whole world, according to the synecdoche just explained) *in one day*, together and at once, in the last day of Christ's passion. Thus by Christ's satisfaction we are taught, that deliverance from sin, and all the happy effects of that immunity, were purchased together and at once for all the elect in general.

VIII. It is however certain, that true saving benefits are bestowed on none of the elect, before he be effectually called, and actually united to Christ by a live-

* 1 Cor. iii. 11.

ly faith: but that did not hinder Chriſt, by his ſatisfaction, from purchaſing for all the elect at once, a right to thoſe benefits, in order to their poſſeſſing and enjoying them, in their appointed time. Nay, before actual converſion, and the poſſeſſion of ſaving bleſſings, they are favored with no contemptible privileges above the reprobate, in virtue of the right which Chriſt purchaſed for them. Such as, 1. That they are in a ſtate of reconciliation and juſtification* actively conſidered, ſatisfaction having been made for them by Chriſt, as we ſee from 2 Cor. v. 19. That is, that God conſiders them as perſons for whom his Son has ſatisfied, and purchaſed a right to eternal life. 2. That God loves them with a peculiar love of benevolence, according to the decree of election; which love of benevolence will, at the time appointed, certainly iſſue in a love of complacency. For as it proceeded from a love of benevolence, that Chriſt was given to be their Saviour; ſo, ſatisfaction being made, God, in conſequence of the ſame love, will form them, ſo as he may deſervedly acquieſce in them, as fit objects of his love of complacency. May we not refer to this, what God ſays, *I have loved thee with an everlaſting love, therefore with loving-kindneſs have I drawn thee?*† 3. It is the effect of this love, that they are favored with the means of ſalvation, the preaching of the goſpel, &c. accompanied with ſome internal illumination, and ſome incitement to good, though not yet ſaving: and that with this deſign, that, in their own time, they may be effectually converted by thoſe means. 4. Hence it likewiſe follows, that God preſerves them, while living under the means of ſalvation, from the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt; from which no one is converted. 5. And laſtly, The Spirit is given

* See laſt of this chap. where this is further explained.

† Jer. xxxi. 3.

them, rendering thoſe means effectual, to their actual and complete regeneration, and uniting them to Chriſt by the infuſion of faith, in order to their enjoying benefits truly ſaving.

IX. As matters ſtand thus, we may eaſily gather, what judgment we are to form of the notions of Arminius and his followers, on this point. Arminius propoſes his ſentiments in *Examine prædeſtin. Perkins. p.* 75, 76. as follows; "Let us add to all theſe things, by way of concluſion, the proper and immediate effect of the death and paſſion of Chriſt. Now, it is not an actual removal of ſin from this or that particular perſon, nor actual remiſſion of ſins, nor juſtification, nor the actual redemption of this or that perſon, which none can have without faith and the ſpirit of Chriſt: but the reconciliation of God, the impetration of remiſſion, juſtification, and redemption before God: hence God now may, notwithſtanding his juſtice, which is ſatisfied, forgive men their ſins, and beſtow the Spirit of grace upon them: though he was really inclined before, from his own mercy (for from that he gave Chriſt to be the Saviour of the world) to confer theſe things on ſinners, yet his juſtice prevented the actual communication of them. However, God has ſtill an entire right to beſtow thoſe benefits on whom he pleaſes, and on what conditions he thinks proper to preſcribe. And, on the contrary, if we agree to ſuch a method of mediation, as you, Perkins, ſeem to approve of, namely, that the ſins of all the elect were actually removed from them, and laid upon Chriſt, who, having ſuffered for them, did actually deliver them from puniſhment; and that obedience was required of him, who accordingly performed it, and thereby merited eternal life, not for himſelf, but for them; no otherwiſe than if we ourſelves had appointed this Mediator in our room, and by him

had paid our debts to God; we must now likewise believe, that, according to the very rigour of God's justice and law, freedom from punishment and eternal life are due to the elect, and that they may demand these benefits from God, in right of payment and purchase made, and yet God have no manner of right to demand of them faith in Christ, and conversion to God. But it is not easy to say with how many absurdities this opinion is charged. I will confute it only by one argument, but a very cogent one, and taken from the apostolic writings. The righteousness wrought out by Christ is not ours, as wrought out, but as imputed to us by faith, so that faith itself is said to be imputed to us for righteousness, Rom. iv. 5." Thus far Arminius, whose very words almost we have exhibited, omitting only those which are not to the purpose in hand. His followers have things of the like nature, in their *Scripta Synodalia*, adding, that the impetration is such, that, "from the nature of the thing, it may remain entire, and be every way perfect, though there were none to apply to it, or none to enjoy the benefit of it."

X. There are many things in this discourse, which are consistent neither with scholastic accuracy, nor with the other tenets of the Remonstrants, nor with theological truth: which we are now to shew in order. 1. Arminius does not speak accurately, in saying, that the proper effect of the death and passion of Christ is not the actual remission of sins, nor justification, nor actual redemption of this or that person, &c. but the impetration of remission, justification, and redemption before God. For the members of this distinction are not properly opposed: to actual remission, and to actual justification, is not opposed the impetration of remission and of justification; but a possible remission, and a possible justification. And thus Arminius ought to have expres-

fed himſelf, if he would have ſpoken accurately and fairly. 2. Nor is it an accurate way of ſpeaking, to ſay, that the effect of the paſſion and death of Chriſt is *impetration of remiſſion and of juſtification.* He ought to have ſaid, it is remiſſion and juſtification itſelf, whatever that be. For ſo Arminius himſelf hath taught us to ſpeak with accuracy, p. 72. "A diſtinction may be made between the act, by which reconciliation is obtained, and the effect of that act, which is reconciliation. The act impetrating reconciliation, is the offering which Chriſt made on the croſs: the effect is the reconciliation itſelf." And ſo he ought to have ſaid here: in the death and paſſion of Chriſt, the impetrating act is that voluntary ſuſception of all kinds of ſufferings, which he undertook both from his love to God and men. The effect is remiſſion and juſtification. The impetrating act is the ſatisfaction of Chriſt. The effect is immunity from debt. In this manner Arminius ſpoke, before he had degenerated to worſe opinions.* "The effects of the prieſtly office are reconciliation with God, impetration of eternal redemption, remiſſion of ſins, the Spirit of grace, and eternal life." 3. Nor has that expreſſion a juſt meaning, at leaſt it is not accurate, that it is by means of the paſſion of Chriſt, *God can forgive* ſins: as if ſome new, ſome greater, and more extenſive power of God, was the effect of the ſufferings of Chriſt. The power of God is infinite, and altogether incapable of increaſe. And then what is impetrated from any one, ought previouſly to be in his power. The Remonſtrants have more accurately expreſſed their ſentiments in their *Synodalia*, in theſe words: "The effect of reconciliation or propitiation, is the impetration of divine grace, that is, reſtitution to ſuch a ſtate," &c. So that

* Diſputat. p. ivat. xxxv. § 7.

a change in our ſtate, and not an increaſe of God's power, is the effect of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt.

XI. Beſides, Arminius is in this diſcourſe conſiſtent, neither with *himſelf*, nor with his *adherents*. Not with *himſelf:* for his whole deſign is to ſhew, that the proper and immediate effect of the death of Chriſt, is only a poſſibility of remiſſion of ſin; and yet he aſſerts, that the proper effect of the death of Chriſt is the reconciliation of God, and the impetration of remiſſion, juſtification, &c. But how do theſe things agree, ſeeing a poſſibility of remiſſion of ſins may conſiſt with a perpetual enmity between God and men? What kind of reconciliation is that, which does not hinder an eternal enmity from ſtill ſubſiſting? What ſort of impetration of remiſſion is that, if nevertheleſs it be poſſible, that ſins may never be pardoned? Nor does Arminius here better agree with the hypotheſis of *his followers;* who expreſsly deny, that God cannot, on account of his vindictive juſtice, remit ſins without a previous ſatisfaction. I now omit mentioning the laboured diſputation of Vorſtius on this head againſt Sibrandus Lubbertus. Thus the Remonſtrants profeſs, in expreſs terms, in their apology, p. 466. drawn up in the name of all, "That to ſuppoſe the vindictive juſtice of God to be ſo eſſential to him, that, in virtue of it, he is bound and neceſſitated to puniſh ſins, is highly abſurd and unworthy of God."

XII. From this alſo a very evident conſequence may be inferred, that the death and ſufferings of Chriſt were in vain, and without any fruit or effect: which I thus demonſtrate. If there is in God, even before, and excluſive of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, a power of remitting ſins, notwithſtanding his vindictive juſtice, Chriſt has therefore done nothing, by ſuffering and dying, in

order to the exiſtence of ſuch a power in God. But the Remonſtrants ſtrenuouſly ſay, declare, and maintain, that God can, without ſatisfaction, and without the violation of his eſſential juſtice, let ſins go unpuniſhed; and they cry out, that the contrary is highly abſurd: Chriſt therefore procured nothing by his death. For what he is ſaid to have obtained by it, did already exiſt without it. "God could have ſaved us without the ſatisfaction of Chriſt; but did not chuſe to do it," ſays Corvinus.*

XIII. In a word, this aſſertion of Arminius is inconſiſtent with theological truth. For, 1. The ſcripture no where teaches, that the fruit of Chriſt's death is a poſſibility of the remiſſion of ſins: nor is one paſſage of ſcripture produced by Arminius to that purpoſe. But to ſpeak of the fruit of Chriſt's death without ſcripture, is untheological. 2. Nay, the ſcripture aſſerts the contrary, as we have at large ſhewn, § 3, 4, 5. 3. It is alſo contrary to all reaſon to ſay, that the proper effect of Chriſt's moſt perfect ſatisfaction was, that God might let the captive go free, yet ſo that the captive might always remain in priſon, and be liable to pay the debt. How abſurd is it, that God ſhould receive full ſatisfaction by the death of his Son, for the ſins of any particular perſon, and yet, notwithſtanding this plenary ſatisfaction of Chriſt, that man is to be ſent to eternal fire, there to ſatisfy, in his own perſon, for thoſe very ſins, which Chriſt had fully ſatisfied for already? 4. Such a bare poſſibility of remiſſion, which, from the nature of the thing, may never become actual, overturns the unchangeable covenant between the Father and the Son; the ſum of which Arminius himſelf has well expreſſed in his oration on Chriſt's prieſthood, p. 14. "God re-

* Cenſura anatom. Molinæi, p. 436.

quired of Chriſt, that he ſhould make his ſoul an offering for ſin, give his fleſh for the life of the world, pay the price of redemption for the ſins and captivity of mankind; and promiſed, if he did ſo, that he ſhould ſee his ſeed, and become an eternal prieſt. The prieſt accepted this condition," &c. Chriſt, relying on this infallible promiſe, did willingly give himſelf up to death. But from this aſſertion of Arminius and the Remonſtrants, it was poſſible, that Chriſt, after having paid the ranſom, ſhould ſee no ſeed, be a king without any kingdom of grace, an everlaſting father without any children, a bridegroom without a bride, a head without a body. All which are moſt abominable.

XIV. Arminius, however, defends his opinion by three arguments. The firſt is this: "God has full right to impart thoſe benefits, to whom he thinks proper, and on what conditions he is pleaſed to preſcribe." Whence it follows, that Chriſt has not merited the beſtowing thoſe benefits actually upon any one; for this is the tendency of theſe words of Arminius. I anſwer, 1. We deny, that it is left entire to God not to impart thoſe benefits, which Chriſt has merited, to thoſe for whom he died. God had entire right to appoint the perſons for whom Chriſt was to die: but, this appointment being once ſettled, God is not at liberty not to give that grace and glory, which was purchaſed by the death of Chriſt, to thoſe for whom he died. 2. Arminius is further miſtaken, when he ſays, that God had a full right to impart thoſe benefits on what conditions he pleaſed to preſcribe, ſuppoſing, that the performance of theſe conditions, namely, faith and repentance, or the grace neceſſary to the performance of them, was not among thoſe bleſſings which Chriſt had merited for us by his paſſion. For it was contained in that compact

between the Father and the Son, according to which Chriſt gave himſelf up to death, that all adult perſons ſhould, in the way of faith and repentance, arrive at the ſaving enjoyment of the other bleſſings of it: nor can any other conditions be now ſettled by agreement. Beſides, it was alſo fixed, that the Father ſhould, from the conſideration of Chriſt's merit, grant the Spirit of grace for faith and repentance, to thoſe for whom Chriſt had died, as we have ſeen Arminius himſelf orthodoxly reckoning the Spirit of grace among the effects of the ſacerdotal office of Chriſt. For, ſeeing God *hath bleſſed us with all ſpiritual bleſſings in Chriſt*,* that is, thro' and for the merits of Chriſt, and the gift of faith is one of the moſt excellent of theſe bleſſings,† that likewiſe certainly comes to us on account of his merits. 3. Nor is it agreeable to ſcripture-language, to ſay, that faith and repentance are requiſite conditions, before any effects of Chriſt's death are communicated to a perſon. Certainly, they are not required previous to our regeneration and vivification from the death of ſin, and our deliverance from this preſent evil world, which are reckoned among the effects of Chriſt's death by Paul.‡ We may therefore ſay, if you will, that theſe are conditions prerequiſite for applying to our conſciences that conſolation purchaſed for us by the death of Chriſt, yet ſo that from the merit of Chriſt grace flows, that is powerfully and abundantly effectual to perform thoſe conditions.

XV. Arminius's ſecond argument is this. "If the actual remiſſion of ſins, &c. be the effect of Chriſt's death, we muſt then allow, that, according to the very rigour of God's juſtice and law, both an eternal life and an immunity from puniſhment, are due to the elect, and that therefore they are entitled to aſk thoſe benefits of

* Eph. i. 3. † Phil. i. 29. ‡ Eph. ii. 5. and Gal. i. 4.

God, in right of the payment and purchaſe made; without God's having any right to require of them faith in Chriſt and converſion to God." I anſwer, 1. We are wholly of opinion, that one, who is renewed, may come boldly to the throne of grace and aſk for thoſe bleſſings, at God's hand, in right of the payment and purchaſe made by Chriſt. For why ſhould we not venture to aſk of God, that he would perform for us what he was pleaſed to make himſelf a debtor for to his Son and to his merits? This is the PARRÆSIA, or boldneſs of our faith, to expect the crown of righteouſneſs from God, as a merciful and gracious giver, in reſpect of our unworthineſs, but as a juſt judge, in reſpect to the merits of Chriſt.* 2. 'Tis an invidious reflection of Arminius, to ſay, "without God's having any right to require of us faith in Chriſt, and converſion to himſelf." For it is impoſſible, that theſe things ſhould not be performed by him, who approaches to God, to aſk thoſe bleſſings. For how can any aſk thoſe benefits from God in the name of Chriſt, without faith in God and Chriſt, and without converſion to the Father and the Son? 3. Let us ſpeak plainly. If we admit of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, and of the ratification of the covenant of grace, and the New Teſtament, then God can, by no right, require faith and converſion from the elect, as conditions of the covenant of grace, in the ſenſe of Arminius and the Remonſtrants; namely, (1.) As to be performed by us, without grace working them in us ſupernaturally, effectually, and invincibly. (2.) As, by ſome gracious appointment of God, coming in the place of that perfect obedience to the law, which the covenant of works required. For in this manner Arminius explains theſe things; that, inſtead of perfect obedience, which the

* 2 Tim. iv. 8.

covenant of works required, the act of faith succeeds, in the covenant of grace, to be, in God's gracious account, imputed to us for righteousness, that is, to be our claim of right to ask eternal life. But the nature of the covenant of grace admits of no such conditions, however framed, on which to build a right to life eternal, either from the justice, or the gracious estimation of God. And thus far Arminius concludes well, if the Mediator has so satisfied for us, as if we ourselves had by him paid our debts, no condition can, by any right, be required of us, which, in any respect, can be reckoned instead of payment. The whole glory of our right to eternal life, ought to be purely ascribed to the alone merit of our Lord; and, on no pretence, be transferred to any one of our acts.

XVI. There is still one argument, which Arminius imagines to be very cogent. "The righteousness," says he, "wrought out by Christ, is not ours, as wrought out, but as imputed to us by faith." I answer, 1. What does Arminius infer from this? Does he conclude, that, besides the satisfaction of Christ, faith is also necessary to salvation? And what then? Therefore Christ did not obtain for us the actual remission of sins. We deny the consequence. For faith is not considered as impetrating, but as applying the impetrated remission. And as the presupposed object of saving faith is remission, already impetrated for all the elect by Christ, it must certainly be the proper effect of the death of Christ. 2. This righteousness of Christ was really his, as it was wrought out *by him*; and it is *ours*, as it was wrought out *for us*; therefore, in a sound sense, even ours before faith, being the meritorious cause of that grace, which is effectual to produce faith in us. It is ours, I say, in respect of *right*, because, both in the decree of God the Father, and the purpose of the Son, it was

wrought out for us, and in the appointed time to be certainly applied to us: though it was not yet ours by *poſſeſſion*, as to our actual tranſlation from a ſtate of wrath to a ſtate of grace, and our acknowledgment and ſenſe of ſo great a benefit vouchſafed unto us. The diſtinction between active and paſſive juſtification is well known.* *The former* is that ſentence of God, by which he declares his having received ſatisfaction from Chriſt, and pronounces, that all the elect are made free from guilt and obligation to puniſhment, even before their faith, ſo far as never to exact of them any payment. *The latter* is the acknowledgment and ſenſe of that moſt ſweet ſentence, intimated to the conſcience by the Holy Spirit, and fiducially apprehended by each of the elect. The one precedes faith, at leaſt as to that general article, which we juſt propoſed; the other follows it. And thus we have defended the value and efficacy of Chriſt's ſatisfaction againſt the cavils of Arminius.

* Others diſtinguiſh the juſtification of the elect, into that which is decretive, virtual, and actual. The firſt is God's eternal purpoſe to juſtify ſinners in time, by the righteouſneſs of Chriſt; but God's eternal purpoſe to juſtify the elect is one thing, and the execution of it another. There was alſo a *virtual* juſtification, upon Chriſt's having made ſatisfaction; and juſtification is actual, when the elect ſinner is enabled to believe in the Son of God, and by faith is united to him. See book iii. chap. viii. § 57, &c.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Neceſſity of Chriſt's Satisfaction.

HAVING explained, from ſcripture, the value of the ſatisfaction of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, to his own

glory, and for the conſolation of the elect, it will not be unſeaſonable to treat of the neceſſity of this ſatisfaction; as what we have ſhewn, § 11. from the apology of the Remonſtrants, naturally leads to this. And here we chuſe not to ſtate the controverſy in the manner, we obſerve, the otherwiſe great Chamier has done in his Panſtratia; namely, *whether God could not, by an act of his abſolute power, grant remiſſion of ſin, without any ſatisfaction.* We are not willing to enter into any diſpute about the abſolute power of God; ſince the conſideration of that ſeems not to ſuit this preſent controverſy. For this debate is not to be explained, and finally determined from the attribute of the power of God; but from thoſe of his holineſs, juſtice, and the like. Some, when they conſider the power of God alone, affirm every thing about it: not reflecting, that God can do nothing but conſiſtently with his juſtice, holineſs, veracity, wiſdom, immutability, in a word, with all his other perfections. The lawyer Papinian* has ſaid well concerning a good man: "that we are to believe, that he *neither does nor can do* any thing prejudicial to piety, reputation, modeſty, and in general, that is contrary to good manners." This certainly ought much more to be affirmed of the great God, that whatever is not a diſplay of, or whatever throws a flur on, any perfection or on the glory of God, cannot be the work of God. Origen has judiciouſly pleaded this cauſe againſt Celſus.† "According to our opinion, God, indeed, can do all things, conſiſtently with his Deity, wiſdom, and goodneſs. But Celſus (not underſtanding, how God may be ſaid to do all things) affirms, he cannot will any thing unjuſt, granting he can do what is ſo, but not will it. But we ſay, that as what is capable of imparting its na-

* ff. lib. xxviii. tit. 7 leg. 15. † lib. iii. p. 154.

tural ſweetneſs to other things, cannot embitter any thing, becauſe that would be contrary to its nature; nor as what naturally enlightens, can, as-ſuch, darken: ſo neither can God act unjuſtly. *For the power of acting unjuſtly is contrary to his very Deity*, and to every power that can be aſcribed to God." And therefore we think it very unbecoming, on every queſtion about the moſt ſacred right of God, to bring his abſolute power on the ſtage. We would rather ſtate the controverſy thus: namely, whether God's requiring Chriſt to give him ſatisfaction, before he reſtore ſinners to his favor, was owing to the mere good pleaſure of the divine will; or whether the natural holineſs, the juſtice, and the like eſſential perfections of God, which he cannot poſſibly part with, required a ſatisfaction to be made? We judge the laſt of theſe to be more true and ſafe.

II. In the preceding book, chap. v. § 19. & ſeq. we proved at large, that the very nature and immutable right of God could not let ſin go unpuniſhed; which we may now lay down as a foundation. At preſent, we will ſubjoin other arguments more nearly relating to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt itſelf.

III. And *firſt*, we may certainly form no contemptible argument from *the event*, and *a poſteriori*. For as God does not needleſsly multiply beings, what probable reaſon can be aſſigned, why, without any neceſſity, he ſhould make his beloved Son, in whom he was well pleaſed, a curſe for us? Let us inſiſt a little on this thought. The infinite wiſdom of God contrived the admirable union of the human nature with one of the divine perſons: ſo that God himſelf might be ſaid to obey, to ſuffer, to die, in a word, to make ſatisfaction. That perſon was *holy*, *harmleſs*, *and undefiled*, the man of God's delight, his only begotten and

only beloved Son. Him the moſt affectionate Father expoſed to the moſt ignominious reproaches, to the moſt cruel ſufferings, and to an accurſed death, as a ranſom for the redemption of ſinners. Theſe ſufferings he, a long time before, predicted in various obſcure ways, and alſo prefigured by the whole train of ſacrifices appointed by Moſes. He permitted the world, after ſo many other crimes, to be ſtained with the guilt of Deicide (from the view of which the very ſun withdrew his rays) a crime, indeed, truly inexpiable, and in the guilt of which the whole Jewiſh nation was involved. Would not all this, to ſpeak with reverence, ſeem a kind of ſolemn farce, if God, by a ſingle breath, could diſpel all our ſins as a cloud? Is it not contrary to the goodneſs, the wiſdom, and holineſs of God, without any neceſſity, and, to ſpeak ſo, in a mere arbitrary way, to proceed in this manner? If he could have reached his end in a direct and compendious way, why did he take ſuch a wide and perplexed compaſs?

IV. I would not have any reply here, that God acted in this manner, in order to manifeſt, that his infinite right or authority over the creature was ſuch, that he might inflict the moſt grievous torments even on the innocent. If God pleaſes to claim that right and authority to himſelf, ſurely, he ſcarce, if ever, has made uſe of it. If at any time he has done ſo, it was in ſufferings of a far more gentle and mild nature, than what Jeſus Chriſt our Lord underwent. In a word, if, for the diſplay of that right, he might at times inflict ſuch grievous torments, yet he would with-hold his hand from his moſt beloved and only Son, in whom he ſo clearly teſtified that he was well pleaſed.

V. To inſiſt upon it, that the whole of this affair was otherwiſe ordered by the arbitrary will of God, for confirming the ſaving doctrine of Chriſt, by this exemplary

martyrdom, is contrary both to reaſon, ſcripture, and experience. For God had many other means, of a far more eaſy nature, by which he could confirm the doctrine of ſalvation, than by the dreadful paſſion of his beloved Son. And the ſcripture ſhews us that this was done by Chriſt's miracles, accompanied with his moſt effectual preaching, and the native demonſtration of the truth ſhewing the divinity of his doctrine; by which things he approved himſelf to John's diſciples,* and even to the whole multitude.† And laſtly, we gather both from ſcripture and experience, that the croſs of Chriſt was *unto the Jews a ſtumbling-block, and unto the Greeks fooliſhneſs.*‡

VI. Nor are we to aſſert, that it was neceſſary we ſhould be taught in ſo laborious a manner, or even by the very example of the Son of God, that it is through many tribulations we are to enter into the kingdom of heaven. For, if nothing elſe was intended, we might have been ſufficiently taught all this, by the examples of other martyrs. And then, of the thouſands of thoſe who are ſaved, there is ſcarce one, who, in the way to ſalvation, ſecluding the curſe of God, has been called to ſuffer ſo many dreadful and great indignities as Chriſt did. Why then were we all to be taught, by the example of the Son of God, that the gate of heaven is on no other terms open, but by paſſing through thoſe hard ſufferings? Unleſs we ſay, that ſatisfaction was made to the juſtice of God by the ſufferings of Chriſt, and that in no other way ſatisfaction could be made thereto; there can no other juſt, holy, and wiſe reaſon, and worthy of God, be ever aſſigned for them. Certainly, for my own part, I never remember to have heard of any.

* Matth. xi. 5. † Luke vii. 16. and John vi. 14.
‡ 1 Cor. i. 23.

VII. If any affirm, that no satisfaction was necessary on account of the justice of God, but that he exacted it on account of some other perfections, namely, to declare his power and will to punish sin, which he might suffer to go unpunished: I answer, such power and will are scarcely to be called perfections in God; seeing Christ* reckons God's mercy, long-suffering, and bounty towards men, even the unjust, among his perfections. Which would certainly be most laudable, if God could, at pleasure, let sin go unpunished, and if that impunity was nowise inconsistent with his most holy nature, and law, which is the transcript of that nature. Nay, if God can, consistently with his highest glory, not punish sin, it might be queried whether he can, consistently with this, inflict punishment at all: because, in that case, he seems to afflict the sinner without a reason, and ill-treat the work of his hands. But to do any thing without a reason, can on no account be for the honor of God.

VIII. Perhaps, some will judge it the safest course, not to intrude into the depths of the unsearchable wisdom and infinite power of God, and to say, God, indeed, was pleased for wise and good reasons, tho' known to himself alone, to set us at liberty, on no other terms, but by the satisfaction of his Son: but yet could, in a far different way, bring us to salvation, nay, and redeem us by a word or sign. And indeed, the great Augustine formerly spoke in this strain. "God could have done all things, had he so willed: but did not, and that for wise reasons, though unknown and incomprehensible to us: but though he had done otherwise, yet he would equally have displeased your folly."† And again, Let us maintain, that this method, by which God sees pro-

* Matth. v. 45, 48. † De agone Christiano.

per to deliver us, by a Mediator between God and men, the man Chriſt Jeſus, is perfectly good and for the honor of God: but alſo, let us acknowledge, that God was at no loſs for another poſſible method, as all things are equally ſubject to his power: but yet none was more adapted to deliver us from our miſery, neither was any neceſſary."* I am certainly much pleaſed with that extreme modeſty, by which we dare not determine any thing raſhly concerning the reaſons and ends of the actions of God; nor judge inconſiderately about his ways, becauſe there is that in them, the reaſons whereof our ignorance cannot unfold; nay, which ſeems to our preſumptuous folly to be againſt reaſon. But when we are able to know and give ſuch reaſons for the divine conduct, as tend to ſet the glory of his adorable juſtice, wiſdom, holineſs, and goodneſs in the cleareſt point of light; it is no longer modeſty, but rather tends to darken the glory of the perfections of God, not to acknowledge them; which is the caſe here. The reaſon, why God, willing to ſave elect ſinners, choſe to do it by the ſatisfaction of his Son, is, becauſe, in his wiſdom, he ſaw no other way, by which ſatisfaction could be made to his eſſential holineſs and juſtice. And by affirming this, we derogate nothing from the power of God, who doubtleſs cannot but act agreeably to his holineſs and juſtice: and we admirably proclaim his wiſdom, which found a means, which appeared impoſſible to every created underſtanding, whereby ſatisfaction might be made to his juſtice, and the ſinner, conſiſtently with his holineſs, be ſaved. In order the more clearly to illuſtrate, and, at the ſame time, the more firmly to eſtabliſh all this, let us attentively conſider, what the ſcripture declares concerning the impulſive and final cauſe of giving Chriſt.

* De Trinitate, lib. xiii. c. 10.

IX. The ſacred writers, on ſeveral occaſions, inculcate, that God's not ſparing his own proper Son, but giving him to us, and delivering him up to death for us, proceeded from his unſpeakable love to the human race.* But if we could be ſaved any other way, than by the ſufferings of the Son of God, the love of God would not ſhine with ſuch luſtre in the giving of that method. For love is truly great and inexpreſſible to the laſt degree, when, implacable juſtice having demanded the puniſhment of mankind, God's love to man, and free purpoſe of giving ſalvation, have nevertheleſs prevailed, by finding out, for that end, in the treaſures of divine wiſdom, an amazing method of reconciling juſtice with mercy; and ſuch indeed, as there could be no room for, without giving up the moſt beloved Son to the moſt cruel torments for us. But if, without any prejudice to juſtice, our ſalvation could be procured many other ways than this, and even by a ſingle word or nod, what great ardency of love was there in giving the Son? It would certainly, have been an inſtance of a very ſingular and notable mercy, to have forgiven our ſins. But to have effected this by the death of his Son, when, without any urgent neceſſity, with equal advantage he could have ſcattered our ſins, ſome other more compendius way, by a nod or ſign, as ſome affirm, why is that urged by Chriſt and his apoſtles, as an argument of ſuch inconceivable love?

X. As to the end of Chriſt's ſatisfaction, the apoſtle teaches, that it was *a demonſtration of the righteouſneſs of God. Whom God hath ſet forth to be a propitiation (propitiatory, mercy-ſeat) through faith in his blood*, EIS ENDEIXIN TES DIKAIOSUNES AUTOU, *to declare his righteouſneſs.*† *God ſet forth* his Son, both *to himſelf*,

* John iii. 16. Rom. v. 8. 1 John iv. 10. † Rom. iii. 25.

delighting in him,* appointing him, in his eternal counsel, to be the Mediator, and viewing him as thus appointed; and *to us*, placing him in open view, and setting him on a throne of grace and glory, in the sight of all. He set him forth as a *propitiation* (propitiatory, mercy-seat;) where the apostle alludes to the cover laid upon the ark of the covenant, which was called KAPPORÆTH, HILASTERION, the propitiatory, *mercy-seat*: signifying that by which God is reconciled to man, in which he dwells and rests, and from which he gives gracious answers. Moreover, it is not called the propitiatory, mercy-seat, unless it be sprinkled with blood, to be applied to us *by faith*. That is, Christ did not reconcile us to the Father but by sufferings. In the tabernacle was KAPPORÆTH BEDDAM SENGIR, *a mercy-seat in the blood of the goat*, that is, sprinkled with the blood of the goat.† Here nothing avails but the blood of him, who is set forth to be a propitiation; unless we would here translate HILASTERION, *an atonement*; an appellation given to Christ, because he is the sacrifice to be offered for sin: which, coming in the room of the guilty, to bear their punishment, not only merits their freedom from punishment, but reconciles God, who before was offended, satisfaction being made to vindictive justice by this vicarious punishment. But to what purpose was all this? *To declare the righteousness of God*, DIA TEN PARESIN, *for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God*. God had passed by, and not punished the sins of believers in former times, and, notwithstanding these, he called the faithful to enter upon the heavenly inheritance. But it was necessary to shew, that this was done without any injury to the justice of God. Now, it is evident, that no

* Is. xliii. 1. † Lev. xvi. 15.

satisfaction was made to divine justice, either by the repentance of believers, or the typical pomp of sacrifices, or by the blood sprinkled on the golden mercy-seat. It remained therefore, that the righteousness of God should be manifested in the propitiation and blood of Christ; by which was plainly shewn, that God, agreeably to his justice, suffers not the sins of any to go unpunished. But if God, without injury to his justice, without any difficulty, and without a satisfaction, can pardon sins; this whole business appears to have been an empty shew, and by no means worthy of God, without any necessity, to appear with such terrible majesty in the most cruel death of his most beloved Son. Which being so horrid to think of, we conclude, from this discourse of Paul, that it was not possible, but God must punish sin; unless he intended to set forth Christ as a propitiation, and so declare his righteousness: because not to punish sin, without a propitiatory atonement, would be a disapprobation of divine justice. For, when justice is not manifested, it is disapproved of; especially in this grand work of our salvation. For so God himself speaks: *My salvation is near to come, and my righteousness to be revealed.**

XI. Some perhaps will say, that *the righteousness* of God here means, as in other places, his *veracity* and *constancy* in performing his promises; the apostle only intending, that God therefore set forth his Son to be a propitiation, in order to fulfil his prophecies and promises, and thus shew himself just, that is, faithful. But it is quite otherwise: for the righteousness of God here denotes that rectitude, by which, according to his law, by inflicting condign punishment, he discovers the demerit of sin and his hatred to it, and how unbecoming

* Is. lvi. 1.

it is for him to have fellowſhip with the ſinner, at the expence of his own glory. And that this is the meaning of this paſſage, is plain, becauſe the apoſtle's deſign is to explain, in what manner God, without any injury to his juſtice, had forborn ſinners, and paſſed by their ſins; and he moſt beautifully ſhews, that all regard was paid to the honor of divine juſtice in the propitiation, by Chriſt's blood made and revealed in due time. For it was in virtue of this, that the ſins of the believers in paſt times were forgiven. But the other explication removes the difficulty juſt mentioned. The deſign of the whole is to ſhew, that God is juſt, when he juſtifies the ſinner for the merits of Chriſt.

XII. It likewiſe is remarkable, that the apoſtle has expreſsly ſaid, and often repeated, that the legal ſacrifices could never aboliſh the guilt of ſin.* But why might not a thing ſo eaſy to be removed without atonement, be expiated by the death of legal ſacrifices? And it is to be carefully obſerved, that when the apoſtle denies this, he attends to the nature of the thing; which it is ſaid they could not do, becauſe it ſeemed otherwiſe to God; but becauſe ſin is of ſuch a nature, that no blood of bulls or of goats can waſh out its ſtain; which the light of nature itſelf will readily yield to, as a thing certain. And indeed the church of the Old Teſtament profeſſed, that their ſins could not be expiated by any blood of calves or rams, not though multiplied to thouſands; by any libations of oil, though ten thouſand rivers thereof were poured out; nay, not by the death of their firſt-born.†

XVII. And we muſt not omit the apoſtle's inference, whereby, from the inability of legal ſacrifices to make

* Heb. x. 1, 4, 11. † Micah vi. 6, 7.

satisfaction, he concludes the necessity of the alone sacrifice of Christ. For after he had said, *It is not possible, that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins;* he immediately subjoins, *Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith*, &c. adding, *He taketh away the first;* namely, the offering of beasts; *that he may establish the second;* namely, the offering of the body of Christ. But that inference would not hold, if there could be some third way by which sins may be expiated, or if no satisfaction was necessary. But now the apostle argues, by supposing it a thing granted by the Jews, that sins cannot be forgiven without a proper atonement; but as this could not be effected by the legal victims, it certainly follows, that it is to be sought for in the offering of Christ, without which, the stain of sin remains for ever indelible. The justness of this inference of the apostle arises from the nature of God, and of the thing itself: for if we are to infer the necessity of the offering of Christ from the free and arbitrary good pleasure of the divine will, the apostle would in vain have connected these consequences. The good pleasure of God only was to be insisted upon.

XIV. In like manner, the same apostle argues, Rom. iii. 19, 20, 21, &c. where he lays it down as a fundamental truth, that the whole world is subject to condemnation before God, whence he infers, that none can be justified by the works of the law; and from that concludes, that we can be justified no other way, but by the blood of Christ; which is doubtless a very trifling way of arguing, if God, by his mercy alone, by his bare nod, can take away sin, and adjudge the sinner to life. For the Jews would very readily answer, that there is another far more compendious way of justification in the infinite mercy of God, and in the most free act of his power, without exposing the Messiah to re

proach. And, to mention it once more, we are not to have recourſe to the moſt free diſpoſition of the divine will, as if that was the alone cauſe of this neceſſity. For if the apoſtle makes any ſuch ſuppoſition, there is an end of all further reaſoning. He would have gained his point, juſt by mentioning that diſpoſition. And if he does not ſuppoſe this, his argument is of no force. Which is far from being the caſe.

XV. Nor is it proper to omit here that expreſſion of the apoſtle, by which he cuts off thoſe who have ſinned againſt the Holy Ghoſt, from all hope of ſalvation, by this argument; becauſe, having rejected Chriſt's expiation, *there remaineth no more ſacrifice for ſin.** Where he would intimate, that there was no hope of pardon left, there he aſſerted, that there remained no more ſacrifice; laying it down as an undoubted truth, that the offering of ſacrifice neceſſarily goes before pardon. If this was not the caſe, why might not man, who wanted a ſacrifice, hope for pardon, without any ſatisfaction, from the infinite mercy of God?

XVI. To the ſame purpoſe is, what the apoſtle ſays,† *It is impoſſible to renew thoſe again unto repentance, who crucify to themſelves the Son of God afreſh, and put him to an open ſhame.* Which laſt words are variouſly explained by divines. But doubtleſs they are intended to give a reaſon, why thoſe who have made the crucifixion of Chriſt of no uſe to themſelves, are excluded from all hopes of ſalvation: becauſe, without that, it is impoſſible to obtain ſalvation. The very learned Moſes Amyraldt thus expounds it; namely, becauſe thoſe apoſtates have no further intereſt in the ſacrifice already offered, becauſe they have rejected it; and therefore, if they would be ſaved, they muſt look out for another. And becauſe

* Heb. x. 26. † Heb. vi. 6. ‡ In diſputat. de peccato in Spiritum Sanctum, § 40.

none could offer a true expiatory ſacrifice except Chriſt alone; if they will be ſaved, it is neceſſary they give up Chriſt to be crucified afreſh, and again expoſed to open ſhame. But it is impious to deſign ſuch a thing, nor can it, on any account, be obtained of God.* If this expoſition be admitted, it preſents us with a very ſtrong argument for our opinion: becauſe it ſuppoſes ſuch an abſolute neceſſity for the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, that if what he has already done, be of no avail, a new ſatisfaction muſt be made, before ever the ſinner can have any hopes of mercy.

XVII. Moreover, this ſentiment of ours tends to diſplay the glory of the moſt excellent perfections of God. It ſets off his *holineſs*, by reaſon of which, he can, in no reſpect, become like a ſinner, or, without due ſatisfaction, allow him to have communion with himſelf, and the inhabitation of his Spirit. It exalts *the juſtice* of God, which is implacably inclined to puniſh ſin. It preſerves inviolable *the infinite majeſty* of God, which, being zealous for his honor, can ſuffer no contempt put upon it, as all ſin does, to go unpuniſhed. It glorifies the unſearchable *wiſdom* of God, which found out a way, above the reach of all created underſtanding, by which juſtice and mercy might be happily reconciled, and the honor of them both maintained pure. In a word, it magnifies the ineſtimable *grace and love* of our Lord, who, when there were no other means of our ſalvation, ſpared not his own Son, but gave him up for us all. And who will not with both hands embrace an opinion, that diſplays in ſuch an eminent manner the glory of God?

XVIII. Nor is it leſs ſubſervient to the promotion of piety. It teaches us to tremble before the majeſty of

* Rom. vi. 9, 10.

the moſt high God, who, from his being God, cannot clear the guilty. It heightens the horror of ſin, which it becomes us to believe is of ſo atrocious a nature, that nothing ſhort of the blood of a moſt holy and truly divine ſacrifice could waſh it away. It ſets before us the moſt unſpotted holineſs of God for our pattern, that, like him, we may entertain a mortal hatred to ſin, and keep ourſelves pure from all manner of fellowſhip with it. In a word, it inflames our hearts, with the moſt deſerved returns of love, willingly to devote ourſelves to his ſervice, who, out of pure grace, delivered up his Son for us unto death, without which we ſhould have remained miſerable through eternity. And thus our opinion contains that true doctrine, which is according to godlineſs.

XIX. And it does not derogate in the leaſt from any of the divine perfections: not from his abſolute *power*; becauſe, without doubt, God cannot deny himſelf and his own perfections; nor, by his actions, teſtify ſin not to be contrary to his nature; nor ever behave, as if he took pleaſure in it, by granting communion of himſelf to the ſinner. Not from his moſt *free will*; as God neither wills, nor can will any thing, but what tends to his glory, which requires his appearing as unlike the ſinner as poſſible. Seneca ſpoke well.* "God is not hereby leſs free, or leſs powerful: FOR HE IS HIS OWN NECESSITY." Nor does it derogate from the *liberty* of thoſe *actions* of God, which are called *ad extra*, or without him. For tho' he is, by no neceſſity of his nature, conſtrained to external operations, conſidered in the groſs; yet, ſuppoſing the exiſtence of one operation without him, many others neceſſarily follow. For inſtance, God was at liberty to create a world out

* Quæſt. nat. lib. 1.

of nothing: but supposing a creation, and by it the existence of a world, it became necessary, that he should govern the same, in a way agreeable to his justice, holiness, wisdom, and goodness. In like manner, here God was at liberty to permit sin; but then having permitted it, his essential justice requires it to be punished. He was also at liberty to save some sinners; yet, having declared his will with respect to this, there was a necessity for a suitable satisfaction to intervene: and all this proceeds from the immutability of the divine perfections, which he cannot, in any of his actions, disavow. As little does this derogate from the wise *counsel* of God, in *ordering* the punishment of it, as to the time, the degree, and the persons. For though we don't think, that God inflicts punishment from his nature, in such a manner as fire burns (though, even in this respect, he compares himself to fire;*) yet his nature is a strong reason, why he orders and inflicts punishment in a most wise manner. Now, the nature of God requires, that his justice be so displayed, as to admit a manifestation of his goodness, because of its riches. Nor does it derogate from the infinite *goodness* of God, as if by that he could grant repentance to the sinner, and so receive him into favor, without a satisfaction. For the bestowing of the Spirit of regeneration, is an effect of the highest love. But that God should so much love a sinner, continuing still impenitent, without the consideration of a satisfaction, is a conduct inconsistent with his other perfections, as we have already so frequently shewn. God cannot but take his Spirit from him, who maketh a mock of him. It is not becoming to grant repentance by means of the same Spirit, without the intervention of the sacrifice of the Priest, whereby sin may be expiated.

* Is. xxvii. 4. and Deut. iv. 24.

XX. Seeing therefore both the nature and actions of God, and the reasonings of the sacred writers, teach us the necessity of a satisfaction; since by that doctrine the eminent perfections of God are placed in the most shining light: seeing the right observance thereof tends very much to promote piety; and as thereby there is no derogation made from any of the divine perfections; we conclude, it is the safest course soberly to embrace it.

XXI. Yet we must observe, when we speak in general of the necessity of a satisfaction, that is, of such a punishment of sin, wherein the righteous and holy God may be justified and sanctified, that we set no bounds to the time, the degree, or the special manner of the punishment. The history of the life and death of Christ makes it very evident, that manifold dispensations, and mitigations, at least a compensation by an equivalent, took place here, and consequently could justly take place. And who can assert, or, if he should presume to say so, can plainly prove, that it was impossible that Christ should undertake and submit to sufferings, fewer in number, shorter in duration, less intense in quantity, as to the parts of the body, and faculties of the soul, the moments and periods of his life spent here upon earth, and so make satisfaction? And here let that saying of Paul be ever a rule to us, *Not to think more highly than we ought to think, but to think soberly.**

* Rom. xii. 3.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Persons for whom Christ engaged and satisfied.

WE should have no certainty of all those things, which it is proper for us to know, for the glory of the

Lord Chriſt, and our own conſolation, concerning his ſuretiſhip and ſatisfaction, did it not alſo appear, for whom he ſatisfied, according to his engagement. The ſolution of this queſtion is indeed of very great moment; but it does not appear very difficult, if we only carefully attend to the nature of Chriſt's ſuretiſhip and ſatisfaction, which we have already explained, proved, and defended from the ſcriptures. For ſince Chriſt did, by his engagement, undertake to cancel all the debt of thoſe perſons, for whom he engaged, as if it was his own, by ſuffering what was meet, and to fulfil all righteouſneſs in their room; and ſince he has moſt fully performed this by his ſatisfaction, as much as if theſe ſinners themſelves had endured all the puniſhment due to their ſins, and had accompliſhed all righteouſneſs: the conſequence is, that he has engaged and ſatisfied for all thoſe, and thoſe only, who are actually ſaved from their ſins. Reaſon clearly teaches this. For Chriſt neither engaged, nor ſatisfied, but for thoſe whoſe perſon he ſuſtained. Which Arminius himſelf* frankly owns. Moreover, that any of thoſe, whoſe perſon Chriſt ſuſtained, and for whom he ſatisfied as their Surety, ſhould be obliged to ſatisfy for the ſame debt, by eternal death, is moſt inconſiſtent with the faithfulneſs and juſtice of God. Nor does it, on any account, appear poſſible, that any one ſhould in earneſt plead, that Chriſt died for all and every one in particular, till he has firſt weakened the force of that expreſſion, *to die for any one*, by which, we lately made appear againſt the Socinians, is denoted a ſubſtitution in the place of another. But it is worth while diſtinctly to ſet forth the true opinion, contained in ſome poſitions.

II. We therefore conclude, 1. That the obedience and ſufferings of Chriſt, conſidered in themſelves, are,

* Adverſus Perkinſum, p. 72.

on account of the infinite dignity of the perſon, of that value, as to have been ſufficient for redeeming not only all and every man in particular, but many myriads beſides, if it had ſo pleaſed God and Chriſt, to have undertaken and ſatisfied for them.

III. 2. That Chriſt as man, ſubject to the law of love, did, in a holy manner, love all men as his neighbours, heartily wiſhed them well, ſeriouſly lamented the ruin of thoſe that periſhed, whom yet, as God, he knew were reprobates, and for whom, as Mediator, he had not engaged. Yet ſo that he ſubmitted this human affection, commanded by the law, which is common to Chriſt, and to us, to the divine appointment, and reſtricted it to the purpoſe of the decreeing will of God; in this manner proving the holineſs of his will, in the glorifying of the divine counſel, and in a due ſubjection thereto. This appears from the tears, which Chriſt, as man, ſhed over the calamities that were coming upon that abandoned city, which had partly ſlain, and partly loaded with contempt and ignominy the prophets; nay, had been the only butchery in the whole world for them; and was at length, by a moſt horrid parricide, to devote itſelf, with its unhappy poſterity, to the laſting curſe of God.*

IV. 3. The ſuretiſhip and ſatisfaction of Chriſt, have alſo been an occaſion of much good even to the reprobate. For it is owing to the death of Chriſt, that the goſpel is preached to every creature, that groſs idolatry is aboliſhed in many parts of the world, that helliſh impiety is much reſtrained by the diſcipline of the word of God, that they obtain at times many and excellent, though not ſaving, gifts of the Holy Spirit, that *they have eſcaped the pollutions of the world through the know-*

* Luke xix. 41.

*ledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.** And who can in short enumerate all those things, which they enjoy, not by accident only, beside the intention of God and of Christ, but by the determinate purpose of God? Not indeed with a design and purpose of saving them according to the testament; but from a view to shew his long-suffering towards the vessels of wrath, that is, those who are to perish, who dwell among those who are to be saved. For, with respect to the intention of God, nothing falls out by accident. Every thing happens according to his determinate counsel.

V. 4. That the obedience and sufferings of Christ are of such worth, that all men without exception, who come to him, may find perfect salvation in him: and it was the will of God, that this truth should, without distinction, be proposed both to them that are to be saved, and to them that are to perish; with *a charge* not to neglect so great salvation, but to repair to Christ with true contrition of soul; and with a most sincere *declaration*, that all who come to him, shall find salvation in him.†

VI. 5. That, however, Christ, according to the will of God the Father, and his own purpose, did neither engage nor satisfy, and consequently in no manner die, but only for all those, and those alone, whom the Father gave him, and who are actually saved. This is that truth, which is controverted, and which we are now to confirm, in a concise, but solid manner, from the sacred writings.

VII. The scripture declares, that Christ satisfied for the whole body of the elect, when it testifies, that *he died for all*, and *that all things were reconciled by him*, as 2 Cor. v. 15. Heb. ii. 9. Col. i. 20. And as this is not to be understood of all and every man in particular, it must be meant of all and every one of the elect.

* 2 Pet. ii. 20. † John vi. 40.

Now, that it cannot be underſtood of all and every individual, I prove from the paſſages quoted, in the following manner. Thoſe *all for whom* Chriſt is ſaid to *have died*,* are thoſe *who are alſo dead*, namely, as to the old man, whom, in virtue of the crucifixion of Chriſt, they have crucified,† and who *live not to themſelves, but to Chriſt*, and to Chriſt, indeed, *who roſe again* for them. But theſe things are ſuch that they cannot be applied to any but the elect. None but they are dead to themſelves, the world, and to ſin: none elſe live to Chriſt. In a word, according to the very hypotheſis of the Remonſtrants, the efficacy of Chriſt's reſurrection is reſtrained to believers alone. In like manner thoſe *all for whom Chriſt is ſaid, by the grace of God, to have taſted death*,‡ are *ſons brought*, or to be brought, *unto glory*, who have Chriſt for the *Captain of their ſalvation*; who *are ſanctified*; whom *he calls his brethren, which God gave him*.§ Theſe things again are ſuch, that they can ſuit the elect only, not the reprobate. In like manner, thoſe *all things* which are ſaid to be *reconciled to God, by the peace made through the blood of Chriſt*,‖ can extend no farther than to the elect. The thing is ſelf-evident. For reconciliation and peace-making with God are peculiar to elect believers.¶ On the contrary, the reprobate are perpetual enemies to God, *on whom the wrath of God abideth*.** By *thoſe things which are on earth*, are underſtood believers, ſtill reſiding in the world; as by *thoſe things which are in heaven*, are meant, not angels, but men in the ſtate of bliſs, who enjoy, in the fulleſt manner, the fruits of Chriſt's atonement and reconciliation.

VIII. Let us add that remarkable paſſage, *God will have all men to be ſaved, and to come unto the* [*acknow-*

* 2 Cor. v. 15. † Rom. vi. 6. ‡ Heb. ii. 9. § Ver. 10, 11, 13. ‖ Col. i. 20. ¶ Rom. v. 1. ** John iii. 36.

ledgment] *knowledge of the truth; Chriſt gave himſelf a ranſom* [*price of redemption*] *for all.** Where, by *all*, we ought not to underſtand all and every one, in particular, but the elect of whatever nation and condition, I make evidently to appear in this manner. 1. They for whom Chriſt gave himſelf a ranſom, are actually reſcued from the dominion of Satan, are brought to liberty, and can never be thruſt into an eternal priſon, in order to ſatisfy again for thoſe debts, which Chriſt paid to the utmoſt farthing. This we muſt certainly maintain, unleſs we would have Chriſt's payment go for nothing. But all and every one in particular are not ſet free from the dominion of Satan. Many are, and do ſtill remain, *children of diſobedience, in whom that impure ſpirit worketh;*† and who are for ever *held captive at his will, in the ſnare of the devil;* and theſe ſhall be forced to ſatisfy for their own guilt. Chriſt therefore did not give himſelf a ranſom for them. 2. Paul ſpeaks of *all* thoſe, whoſe *Mediator* Chriſt is. Now, he is Mediator, both by *the offering* of his body and blood, and by his *powerful interceſſion.* Which latter part of his mediation can, on no account, be excluded here, when the apoſtle is treating concerning our prayers, of which we have a moſt perfect pattern in the prayers of Chriſt. Beſides, as the Remonſtrants acknowledge, Chriſt's interceſſion is not for all and every man in particular. Therefore Chriſt is not the perfect Mediator of all and every individual. 3. What is here ſpoken, is concerning all thoſe *whom God will have to be ſaved, and come to the* [*acknowledgment*] *knowledge of the truth.* But this is not his will concerning every man in particular, becauſe he will have unbelievers condemned.‡ And the acknowledgment of the truth, or *faith, is not the priviledge of*

* 1 Tim. ii. 4, 6. † Eph. ii. 2. ‡ John iii. 36.

all,* but of the *elect*.† Nor is it the will of God it ſhould. *He hardeneth whom he will*.‡ Beſides, it is unworthy of the divine majeſty, to imagine, that there is an *incomplete*, *unreſolved*, and *ineffectual volition* in God.§ And it is mere trifling and mean, to underſtand here a bare *will of precept*, enjoining all to work out their own ſalvation with fear and trembling, and, with all diligence, to ſeek the knowledge of the truth; or a will of good pleaſure, approving what is according to the precept; nor do they with whom we now argue, take it in that light. 4. The perſons here meant are all thoſe for whom we are to pray. But we are not to pray for all and every one in particular: not certainly for thoſe who are already damned; not for the ſalvation of all who are now alive, collectively taken; becauſe we cannot do it in faith; and we are ſure that many of them will be damned: nor, in fine, for thoſe *who have ſinned the ſin unto death*.‖ 6. And laſtly, it is acknowledged, that theſe words are made uſe of by the apoſtle, as a motive for the prayers which he requires, and which he would ſhew ſhall not be in vain. But if the words of the apoſtle only ſignified, that Chriſt has, by his ſatisfaction, obtained no more than a poſſibility for God to be reconciled to all and every one in particular, though, by the nature of that impetration, it is poſſible none may be actually ſaved, they would expreſs no conſequence; becauſe, if that death has only procured a poſſibility of ſalvation, and if our deſires after that ſalvation might be ineffectual, we could neither be ſure of their being heard, nor have that hope of audience, which maketh not aſhamed. It remains then, that we conclude, that Chriſt gave himſelf a ranſom of redemption for all the elect, of whatever nature and condition, and that it is

* 2 Theſſ. iii. 2. † Tit. i. 1. ‡ Rom. ix. 18. § Pſal. cxv. 3.
‖ John v. 16.

the will of God, they all ſhould be ſaved; conſequently, that it is our duty to be ſubſervient, by our prayers, to this counſel of God; and as we know not how to diſtinguiſh the elect from the reprobate, to pray indiſcriminately for all, referring it to God, to diſtinguiſh thoſe that are his; eſpecially, becauſe we are certain, we ſhall not pray in vain for thoſe whom God wills to be ſaved, and for whom Chriſt gave himſelf.

IX. The ſcripture inculcates the ſame truth, when it ſays, that *Chriſt gave his fleſh for the life of the world;** that he is *the propitiation for our ſins, and not for ours only, but alſo for the ſins of the whole world;*† that *God was in Chriſt reconciling the world to himſelf;*‡ that *Chriſt is the Lamb of God, that taketh away the ſins of the world.*§ And other paſſages to the like purpoſe. Where by the term *world*, cannot, nay, ought not, properly to be underſtood the whole of mankind, but the elect. Which we prove by the following arguments.

X. It is clear, that, in the holy writings, things are ſometimes ſaid of the world, which do not agree but to the elect and to believers. Thus Chriſt prays, *that the world may believe, that thou haſt ſent me;*‖ and,¶ *that the world may know, that thou haſt ſent me.* But theſe things belong to that ſacerdotal interceſſion of Chriſt, "concerning which we may, with the greateſt certainty, conclude, that it will never be rejected," ſays Arminius;** and which, it is certain, is not made for the world of reprobates, Chriſt having expreſsly declared that;†† and they with whom we argue, do not refuſe it. It is therefore neceſſary, that by the *world* we here underſtand *the world of the elect*, who believe on Chriſt, and know him by faith, by virtue of the interceſſion of

* John vi. 51. † 1 John ii. 2. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 19. § John i. 29. ‖ John xvii. 21. ¶ Ver. 23. ** In oratione de ſacerdotio Chriſti. †† Ver. 9.

Christ, and by means of the ministry, together with the holy and glorious example of believers.

XI. Moreover, many texts, which speak of salvation, not only as *impetrated*, but as *applied*, ascribe it to the world. Thus Christ declares, *For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.** But the intention of God in sending his Son is not to save all, but *that whosoever believeth in him, should not perish, but have eternal life*, as Christ explains himself in the foregoing verses. In like manner, *The bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.*† But Christ gives life only to the elect, to the sheep, and not to the goats.‡ Thus Christ, in prosecuting his discourse above quoted, John vi. restrains the term *world* to those *whom the Father gave him, who see the Son, and believe on him*, ver. 39, 40.

XII. These expressions likewise, *the Father of those that* believe, and *the heir of the world*, denote the same thing, in the promise made to Abraham.§ Abraham is *the father of those that believe.* 1. As a pattern of faith. 2. As a pattern of the blessing, or of justification by faith. 3. On account of Christ, who descended from him, and by whose Spirit the elect are born again. Whence Christ, along with his mystical body, is called *the seed of Abraham.*‖ He is *the heir of the world*, that is, of all the families of the earth, who are blessed in him, as in the pattern of faith and of the blessing by it, and in his seed Christ, as the fountain of every blessing. For this is that world which Christ receives for an inheritance; as also, Abraham, and consequently every believer, who are his seed, in Christ; that is, who becomes Christ's own possession, and with whom Abra-

* John iii. 17. † John vi. 33. ‡ John x. 27, 18. § Rom. iv. 11, 12, 13. ‖ Gal. iii. 16.

ham and every believer have communion, exulting in the good things which are bestowed upon them.* For that strict union and sincere love which subsist between them, are the reason, that every one rejoices in, and glorifies God, on account of the benefits bestowed on his neighbour, as if bestowed on himself. And thus we have made it appear, that the term *world* sometimes in scripture denotes *the collective body of believers*, or *of the elect*.

XIII. We add, that the Holy Ghost speaks in this manner, with great propriety, and for several substantial reasons. For, 1. The term *world*, generally in the common way of speaking, denotes any large *body* or *multitude* of men whatever. Thus *the Pharisees said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail nothing? behold, the world is gone after him.*† We have a like phraseology in Horajot. c. 3. in Gemara; "When Rabbi Simeon, the son of Gamaliel, entered," (namely, into the synagogue) "the whole world rose up before him;" that is, all who were present in the synagogue. What then should hinder a very large and almost infinite multitude of the chosen people from among all nations, *that great multitude which no man can number*,‡ from being elegantly designed by the appellation *world*? 2. Elect believers, considered in themselves, and *before effectual calling*, are a part of *the world lying in wickedness*.§ *In time past they walked in trespasses and sins, according to the course of this world.*‖ And so far they belong to that *world, which is become guilty before God.*¶ But this tends to illustrate the glory of the love of God and Christ, and to the humiliation of believers; that, while they were a part of the wicked world, Christ was given to be their Redeemer. 3. Elect believers, *after*

* 1 Cor. iii. 21, 22. † John xii. 19. ‡ Rev. vii. 9.
§ 1 John v. 19. ‖ Eph. ii. 1, 2. ¶ Rom. iii. 19.

effectual calling, and considered as beautified with divine grace, are though the *less*, yet the *best* part of the world. *The saints and the excellent, that are in the earth.** *The holy seed*, which *is the substance* [support] *of the earth.*† And as the Jews are wont to speak, "the just are the pillars of the world." But what is more usual, what more suitable, than that the whole should, by a synecdoche, signify the better, as sometimes the greater part? It is therefore not without its emphasis, and yields useful instructions, when we hear *the collective body of the elect* designed by the name of the *world*.

XIV. Now let us apply these things to the passages we have already quoted, § 5. Christ indeed says, when speaking of *impetration*, John vi. 51. that *he will give his flesh for the life of the world;* but, in the same chapter, ver. 33. when speaking of the *application*, he says, that *he giveth life to the world:* and so he explains, what, in the subject of redemption, he would have us to understand by *the world*. But it is a capital truth, that the application of redemption extends no further than to believers and the elect.

XV. When John writes, that *Christ is the propitiation not only for our sins, but also for the sins of the whole world;*‡ he shews us by these words, who they are that can take comfort to themselves from the intercession of Christ, and the remission purchased by him. Now, elect believers alone can do this; he is their Advocate with the Father, and not that of the reprobate. To them, and not to the reprobate, *God hath set him forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood.*§ Moreover, this consolation belongs not only to the elect from among the Jewish nation, such as John was, but also to the elect from among the Gentiles, whom Paul expres-

* Psal. xvi. 3. † Is. vi. 13. ‡ 1 John ii. 2. § Rom. iii. 25.

ly points out by the name of the *world.** By a phraseology very usual among the Hebrew doctors, who call the Gentiles UMMOTH NGOLAM, *the nations of the world.* Nor does this saving truth yield comfort to those believers only, who *lived at that time*, and to whom, as to his little children, John was writing; but also to those who lived in *the antideluvian world*, and under the Mosaical pedagogy, whose sins were no otherwise expiated, than by the blood of Christ; and in fine, to those believers, who, from John's days, were *to be brought* to Christ out of all nations whatever, *to the end of the world;* which very great multitude is deservedly designed by the name of *the whole world.* For it is very certain, that by the whole world is not denoted the collective body of all and every one of mankind: for John expressly discriminates himself, and those to whom he is writing, from the whole world, whom yet he could not seclude from being a part of the collective body of mankind.

XVI. When Paul says,† that *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself*, he immediately subjoins, that this was, *by not imputing their trespasses unto them:* to teach us, that reconciliation and non-imputation are of equal extent. But the latter is the privilege of the elect and of believers alone, and of those in whose heart there is no guile. For David declares *those blessed, to whom God imputeth not iniquity.*‡ Therefore, by the world, the world of the elect is signified.

XVII. Christ is called *the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world.*§ But, like that goat, on which the iniquity of the children of Israel was laid, he taketh them away, by taking them upon himself, by satisfying for them, as if they were his own, and by taking

* Rom. xi. 12, 15. † 2 Cor. v. 19. ‡ Psal. xxxii. 1, 2. and Rom. iv. 6, 8. § John i. 29.

them away from his people, as to their guilt, by justification, and as to their dominion and stain, by sanctification: compare 1 Pet. ii. 24. But as these things point to the impetration of salvation, so as at the same time to include its application, they cannot be extended beyond the world of the elect believers. *Blessed is* ASHREI NESU PÆSHANG *he whose transgression is taken away* [forgiven.*]

XVIII. And thus we have shewn, that though the scripture, when speaking of the world of the redeemed, really designs some collective body, yet it is that of the elect only. Which Prosper elegantly expressed:† "In the elect, even those foreknown, and discriminated from every generality, or collective body, there is deemed to be a certain peculiar kind of universality; so as that a whole world seems to be delivered out of a whole world, and all men to be redeemed from among all men."

XIX. Let us now more especially shew, that Christ made satisfaction for the elect only. To this purpose are those passages of scripture, in which the death of Christ is restricted to *his sheep*, *his church*, *his people*, nay, and *his peculiar people*.‡ From which we thus argue: What the scripture restricts to some certain kind of men, to the manifest exclusion of the rest, ought not to be extended absolutely to all men. But the scripture, in the passages quoted, limits the death of Christ to a certain kind of men, so as manifestly to exclude the rest. Therefore, &c. The truth of the major is evident from the terms: that of the minor, from the passages quoted. In order to illustrate this, we are to shew these two things: 1. That the subject-matter is the *impetration* of salvation, which is the act of Christ; and not the *fruition* alone, which is our act. 2. That the death of

* Psal. xxxii. 1. † De vocat. Gent. lib. i. c. 3. or in another edition, c. 9. ‡ John x. 15. Acts xx. 28. Eph. v. 25. Tit. ii. 14.

Chriſt is ſo *reſtricted* to thoſe, who are there deſcribed, as to exclude the reſt of mankind. The Remonſtrants, not being able otherwiſe to reſiſt the force of this argument, deny both theſe.

XX. As to the *former*, namely, that the impetration of ſalvation is here intended, I thus prove. 1. The very terms which the Holy Spirit uſes in the paſſages quoted, *to lay down his life for ſome*, *to purchaſe ſome*, *to give himſelf for ſome*, import ſatisfaction, impetration, and acquiſition. Nor does the ſcripture uſually ſpeak in any other ſtrain, when the ſubject is evidently concerning impetration. 2. In the paſſages quoted, we have a clear deſcription of what Chriſt has done, both without us and without our concurrence; whereas the real fruition, concerning which the Remonſtrants will have thoſe paſſages to be underſtood, is our act. Theſe two differ much both in *nature* and *time*. In *nature*; for the one reſembles a mean appointed for ſome end; the other an extrinſic end, or rather the uſe of that, for which that mean is appointed. In *time*; for theſe propoſitions were completely verified the moment, in which Chriſt laid down his life: but the actual enjoyment is a thing accompliſhing ſucceſſively for a long tract of time in all the elect. 3. The Remonſtrants themſelves produce ſimilar phraſes from ſcripture, of *dying for ſome*, *purchaſing ſome*, &c. when they contend, that the impetration of the grace of God reaches to others beſides the elect; with what colour, then, do they deny that impetration is here the ſubject-matter? 4. They ſhew, that they lay no ſtreſs on theſe paſſages, when they afterwards affirm, they cannot refer to believers alone, and maintain that, by the church, we are not to underſtand the elect alone, or that Chriſt gave himſelf for them only. Therefore, I ſay, to purchaſe and give himſelf for a perſon, cannot here be underſtood of real

enjoyment, which is peculiar to believers only. 5. And laſtly, By making this exception, the anſwer of the Remonſtrants comes only to a begging the queſtion: for we maintain, and are directly to prove it by the ſtrongeſt arguments, that the application of ſaving grace is as extenſive as its impetration; and we own, the queſtion here is not concerning ſuch an impetration, as may have its plenary effect, though applied to no body. For ſuch an impetration we judge abſurd, untheological, and highly unworthy of Chriſt.

XXI. The *ſecond*, namely, which reſpects the excluſion of the reſt of mankind, when diſtinct mention is made of *the ſheep*, *the church*, *a peculiar people*, I ſhall make evident; firſt, by ſhewing, that by theſe appellations, *ſheep*, *church*, *peculiar people*, cannot be underſtood all men in general; and then that what is here aſſerted of the *ſheep*, *church*, *peculiar people*, flows from that extraordinary love of Chriſt, which he has not for the reſt of mankind. The *firſt* has no great difficulty in it: for Chriſt expreſsly ſays to ſome, *Ye are not of my ſheep*.* And therefore he divides mankind into *ſheep* and *goats*; of whom, the *laſt* are undoubtedly reprobate, the former, certainly the elect, and heirs of eternal life.†

XXII. Our opponents themſelves will not affirm, that all belong to the church. They indeed ſay, that the viſible church is meant, in which there are others beſides the elect. But, 1. It ſufficiently anſwers our purpoſe, that all and every one in particular cannot be underſtood. 2. That what is ſaid of the viſible church, is ſometimes of ſuch a nature, as can be underſtood only of the elect therein: as when the apoſtle, writing to the viſible church of the Epheſians, ſays, *He hath choſen you in him*:‡ and in like manner, 1 Theſſ. i. 4.

* John x. 26. † Matth. xxv. 33. ‡ Eph. i. 4.

And we ſhall preſently ſhew, that what is ſaid of the church in the places quoted, is of the ſame nature.

XXIII. In a word, that all cannot be numbered among the *people of God*, God himſelf declares, while he cries to ſome, LO NGAMMI, *Ye are not my people*, Lo-ammi.* And they who diſſent from us, take a wrong courſe, when by *people* they underſtand the Jews, among whom too were reprobates. Thus we learn from Paul, that, with reſpect to ſpiritual privileges, they are not all accounted Iſrael, who are of Iſrael, and therefore not to be reckoned the people, Rom. xi. 1, 2.†

XXIV. But it is not enough to have ſhewn, that the names *ſheep*, *church*, *people*, do not comprehend every individual of mankind: for it is poſſible, that, on a particular occaſion, ſomething might be ſaid of ſome perſons, which certainly agrees to them, but not to them only. The queſtion is not, whether Chriſt died for the elect, but whether for them only? Our adverſaries ſay, this cannot be concluded from thoſe paſſages, where the particle *only* is not added. We muſt therefore ſhew, that theſe things are ſo appropriated to the elect, as to exclude the reſt of mankind. I prove it thus: All the paſſages quoted tend to amplify the extraordinary love of Chriſt towards his ſheep, for whom he laid down his life; towards the church, which he purchaſed with his own blood; towards his people, for whom he gave himſelf. But if in this buſineſs the ſheep, the church, and people of Chriſt have nothing peculiarly diſtinguiſhing beyond all other men, what probable reaſon can be aſſigned, why that infinite love of Chriſt, in laying down his life, ſhedding his blood, and giving himſelf, ſhould eſpecially be appropriated to them?

XXV. To this reaſoning our adverſaries abſurdly oppoſe Paul's glorification, who, while writing,‡ that

* Hoſ. i. 9. † To this quotation of the author's may be added Rom. ix. 6. ‡ Gal. ii. 20.

Chriſt was given for him, does not exclude others from a ſhare in the ſame love. For, in that text, Paul does not ſpeak of any divine love, whereby God peculiarly diſtinguiſhed him from others, who had the like precious faith with himſelf; nor does he conſider himſelf as Paul, but as an *elect* perſon, and *a believer*, propoſing himſelf there, as an example, in the name of all believers: and we are ſo far from being able to infer from this, that what Paul affirms of himſelf was peculiar to him, that quite the reverſe ought to be concluded. This inſtance therefore does not ſuit the caſe.

XXVI. But let us conſider each paſſage apart. When Chriſt publicly declares, that *he lays down his life for his ſheep*, he thence infers, that *he muſt bring them to hear his voice, that there may be one fold and one ſhepherd.** But it is certain, that theſe laſt aſſertions agree to elect believers only, and therefore alſo the firſt, from which the others are deduced. For it would not be a juſt inference, to ſay, I lay down my life for my ſheep, therefore I muſt bring them to hear my voice, &c. did he lay down his life for ſome, whom he never brings, &c.

XXVII. When Paul ſaid, that Chriſt *purchaſed his church with his own blood*,† he more diſtinctly explains, in his epiſtle to the Epheſians,‡ what he means by the church, which Chriſt loved and gave himſelf for, namely, the ſpouſe of Chriſt, whom alone he loves with a conjugal affection, and ſanctifies, and preſents glorious to himſelf. Now, that love of Chriſt, which was the motive of his giving himſelf, and of the ſanctification and glorification of the church, which are the fruits of that donation, belongs to elect believers only; therefore alſo the very giving itſelf, which is the conſequence of that love, and the cauſe of the ſanctification of the church. Moreover, that this conjugal love of Chriſt,

* John x. 15, 16, 17. † Acts xx. 28. ‡ Chap. v. 25.

whereby he purchaſed the church, as his ſpouſe, by his own blood, has the general aſſembly of the elect alone for its object, to wave other conſiderations, may be hence alſo inferred, becauſe Paul propoſes it here as a pattern of the conjugal love of the huſband for the wife. But this love ought doubtleſs to reach no farther than the wife.

XXVIII. Laſtly, when Paul reminds his ſon Titus, that *Chriſt gave himſelf for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himſelf a peculiar people, zealous of good works*,* he evidently ſhews, what was the fruit of Chriſt's giving himſelf; namely, redemption from iniquity, and the purification of a peculiar people, &c. And conſequently they who are not redeemed from iniquity, nor purified, nor made his peculiar people, &c. cannot glory in this, that Chriſt gave himſelf for them.

XXIX. What the apoſtle writes in this chapter, ver. 11. that *the grace of God, that bringeth ſalvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that denying ungodlineſs*, &c. neither avails our adverſaries, nor is any wiſe detrimental to the truth we maintain. For, 1. The preaching of the goſpel, by which the ſaving grace of God is offered, and which is here intended by that expreſſion, had not reached all mankind without exception, nay nor every nation, in the days of Paul. 2. The preaching of the goſpel reaches the ears of a great many more than of thoſe, who are the objects of that love of Chriſt which bringeth ſalvation: for it is only an external mean, by which the elect, out of every nation, are brought to the communion of Chriſt. And therefore the goſpel is to be preached to every nation, that the elect therein may hear it. 3. We ſhould obſerve the apoſtle's ſcope, which is to encourage ſervants

* Tit. ii. 14.

to the exercise of universal piety, that, by their holy conversation, *they may adorn the doctrine of Christ in all things*. The reason he gives for this is, because the saving grace of Christ has appeared, both to masters and servants, teaching us, &c. As if he had said, "That all men, of whatever rank, professing the gospel, ought to reckon it their duty to adorn its doctrine by the purity of their manners: for as to the doctrine itself, it so plainly, so expressly, and so efficaciously instructs us in all goodness, as none but they who wilfully stop their ears, can be ignorant of. And therefore all the professors of it, as well masters as servants, should take care, lest they bring a scandal on this most perfect of all rules, by lives which have little or no conformity to it." This is the full import of these words, so that any may see, that they make nothing for the universal efficacy of Christ's death.

XXX. If we search the matter to the bottom, we will most clearly discern, that it never was Christ's intention, to satisfy for all in general. Certainly, he satisfied only for those he engaged for. But he engaged *to do the will of his Father*.* But this is the will of his Father, not that every man should be saved, but those that were given him, that is, the elect out of every nation, who are to receive the gift of faith. Those the Father gave him for an inheritance by an irrevocable testament. For thus Jehovah speaks.† *It is a light thing, that thou shouldst be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayst be my salvation unto the end of the earth.* And Christ himself still more clearly.‡ *This is the Father's will, which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing.*

* Psal. xl. 9. † Is. xlix. 6. ‡ John vi. 39.

But all are not given to Chriſt, only thoſe *that come to him.** *All that the Father giveth me, ſhall come to me.* He therefore only engages for theſe, according to the will of the Father: he took their ſins upon him, carried them on his heart, when he offered himſelf to the Father; claims them as his peculiar property, in virtue of his merit, according to agreement, challenges them for his own, and will, at length in due time, preſent them holy and glorious to his Father, ſaying, *Behold I, and the children which God hath given me.*† All theſe things naturally flow from the very nature of the covenant which ſubſiſts between the Father and the Son, as formerly explained.

XXXI. And theſe particulars may be further illuſtrated and confirmed from Aaron's typical prieſthood. The high prieſt, on the ſolemn day of expiation, ſlew one of the goats, on which the ſins of all Iſrael were laid, and ſent the other into the wilderneſs. All theſe things were typical. The high prieſt, the ſacrifice, the ſcape-goat, all ſet forth Chriſt. But who were typically deſigned by Iſrael? Not indeed all men. For what is more abſurd than that Iſrael ſhould be a type of the Edomites and Egyptians, and of all that world, out of which they were choſen, and from which, on ſo many accounts, they were diſtinguiſhed? We therefore conclude, that they were typical of the elect, who are the true Iſraelites, Jews inwardly, and in the ſpirit, and whom the apoſtle loves to diſtinguiſh by the name of *the election.*‡ For the nature of the type conſiſted in this, that the people of Iſrael was choſen by an external pomp of ceremonies, was redeemed, and in their meaſure was a holy prieſthood. They therefore prefigured thoſe, who were truly choſen, redeemed, and conſecrated a royal prieſthood to God; as Peter ſeems not

* John vi. 37. † Heb. ii. 13. ‡ Rom. xi. 7.

obſcurely to ſignify.* As therefore the high prieſt formerly offered an atoning ſacrifice not for the Egyptians or Canaanites, but for the typical Iſrael only; ſo our High Prieſt according to the order of Melchizidek, offered himſelf once, not for abandoned reprobates, but for myſtical Iſrael, that is, the truly-choſen.

XXXII. This ſame truth will appear moſt clearly, if we attend to ſome of the inſeparable effects of Chriſt's ſatisfaction. It would carry us too far to enumerate all: let us conſider ſome of the principal. *If they who were enemies to God were reconciled by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, they ſhall be ſaved by his life.*† For whom God, not ſparing his own Son, gave him up unto death, *with him freely he gives them all things.*‡ We may boldly ſay to them, for whom Chriſt died, *Who ſhall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that juſtifieth. Who is he that condemneth?*§ &c. They whom Chriſt *redeemed from the curſe of the law*, are not under the curſe, but *the bleſſing of Abraham cometh upon them.*‖ But this is not true of all and every one, but of elect believers only, that they are ſaved by the life of Chriſt; that with Chriſt God freely gives them all things; that none can lay any thing to their charge, or bring an accuſation againſt them; that upon them is come the bleſſing of Abraham. Therefore they alone are the perſons, of whom the foregoing things may be truly affirmed.

XXXIII. Add, that that fictitious ſatisfaction for the reprobate, and thoſe who periſh, is altogether a vain and uſeleſs thing. For whom does it profit? Not certainly God, who by no act can be rendered happier than he is. Not Chriſt himſelf, who, as he never ſeeks them, ſo he never receives them for his peculiar proper-

* 1 Pet. ii. 5. † Rom. v. 10. ‡ Rom. viii. 32.
§ Ver. 33, 34. ‖ Gal. iii. 13, 14.

ty; and neither is he enriched by poſſeſſing them, though ſuppoſed to have purchaſed them at a dear rate. Not believers, who, content with their portion in God and in Chriſt, and fully redeemed by Chriſt, enjoy a happineſs in every reſpect complete. In fine, not thoſe that periſh, who are conſtrained to ſatisfy, in their own perſons, for their ſins to the utmoſt farthing. But to affirm the ſatisfaction of Chriſt to be a vain and uſeleſs thing, is abſurd, and borders upon blaſphemy. Remigius, formerly biſhop of Lyons, ſaid extremely well, when diſcourſing at large on this controverted point, "The blood of Chriſt is a great price; ſuch a price can, in no reſpect, be in vain and ineffectual, but rather is filled with the ſuperabundant advantage ariſing from thoſe bleſſings, for which it was paid." See Forbeſ. inſtruct. hiſt. lib. 8. c. 16.

XXXIV. Nor are we to ſay, that therefore the reprobate have no benefit by the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, becauſe the condition of faith and perſeverance, which the reprobate do not perform, is neceſſary to that purpoſe. For, firſt, it is not true, that faith and perſeverance are pre-requiſite conditions, before a perſon can enjoy any of the fruits of Chriſt's ſatisfaction. For regeneration itſelf and effectual calling, which go before actual faith; juſtification, adoption, and ſanctification, which precede final perſeverance in the faith, are the fruits of Chriſt's moſt excellent ſatisfaction. And then, from the want of faith and perſeverance in thoſe that periſh, we have a moſt effectual proof, that the blood of the new covenant was not ſhed for them; for by that Chriſt has merited for his people the continuance of the new life in faith and love. Seeing he is *the Mediator of* that *better covenant, which was eſtabliſhed upon better promiſes.** But theſe promiſes are, ſanctification;† *I will*

* Heb. viii. 6. † Ver. 10.

put my laws into their mind; and the continuance thereof, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.* For, in the new covenant, to be a God to any, is to be an everlasting Saviour, as we gather from Matth. xxii. 32. and which the opposition made between the new and the old covenant, in like manner, shews.* These promises, being graciously and actually conferred on the elect, in virtue of Christ's satisfaction, would have certainly been conferred on the rest of mankind, had Christ equally satisfied for them.

XXXV. Nay, the satisfaction of Christ for the reprobate had not only been useless, but highly unworthy both of God and of Christ. Unworthy of the wisdom, goodness, and justice of God, to exact and receive satisfaction from his most beloved Son for those, whom he neither gave, nor wanted to give to his Son, and whom he decreed to consign to everlasting confinement, that they might suffer in their own persons according to the demerit of their crimes. Unworthy of Christ, to give his blood a price of redemption for those, whom he had not in charge to redeem. And, if we may speak freely, this also, in some respect, would be for Christ *to account the blood of the new covenant*, or the new covenant itself, *by which he was sanctified, a common*, or unholy *thing*.

XXXVI. It would now remain to refute the arguments of those on the other side of the question: but this has been done at large, and with so much judgment, by very learned men, that we can scarce make any addition. The very accurate dissertation of Gomarus on this head, may especially be consulted, which is inserted in his commentaries on the epistle to the Galatians.

* Heb. viii. 8, 9.

CHAP. X.

After what manner Chriſt uſed the Sacraments.

THUS far we have at large treated of thoſe things, that relate to the compact between Chriſt and the Father: and we might ſeem to have completely finiſhed that ſubject, was it not proper to add ſomething concerning the ſacraments, by which that compact was confirmed. The apoſtle has obſerved,* that, *not without an oath*, Chriſt was made Prieſt, and the Surety of a better teſtament. As this manifeſted the ſtability of the covenant, and the immutability of God's counſel; ſo it likewiſe contributed to the full aſſurance of Chriſt the Mediator. It moreover pleaſed God, to confirm that covenant by certain external ſymbols, and indeed the very ſame, by which the covenant of grace was ſealed to believers, under the different diſpenſations of it. We have above hinted ſomething on this ſubject, which we are now to enlarge upon more diſtinctly.

II. It is evident, that the Lord Jeſus was *circumciſed* on the eighth day from his birth,† that he kept *the paſſover* with his diſciples,‡ and was *baptized* by John.§ Though the evangeliſts do not indeed expreſsly aſſert, that he alſo partook of the holy *ſupper*; yet they relate what we think may make it more than probable he did.

III. 1. It is certain, that our Lord, in the inſtitution and uſe of the myſtical ſupper, borrowed moſt of the rites from the Jewiſh paſſover. The very learned Joſeph Scaliger, Ludovicus Capellus, and moſt particularly, Buxtorf in a peculiar diſſertation, have made this as clear as noon-day. Thus our Lord took the

* Heb. vii. 20, 21. † Luke ii. 21. ‡ Luke xxii. 8, 11.
§ Matth. iii. 13.

bread and cup diſtinctly, ſeparately bleſſed them both, and gave them to his diſciples, after the Jewiſh manner. It was beſides, a cuſtom among the Jews, for the maſter of the family to eat firſt of the bread after bleſſing. To this purpoſe Maimonides* ſays, "The gueſts were not to eat or taſte any thing, till he who broke, had taſted firſt." Nor was it permitted, at feſtivals and ſolemn feaſts, for any of the gueſts to drink of the cup, till after the maſter of the family had done it firſt; according to an expreſs paſſage quoted by Buxtorf from the Talmud, where it is ſaid, "to be an excellent precept, that he who ſanctifies or bleſſes, ſhould firſt taſte, and after all the gueſts ſitting down, taſted; every one took a draught;" ſee the bove diſſertation, § 76. In this manner Chriſt acted at the paſchal ſupper, Luke xxii. 15, 17. and why not ſo at this new myſtical ſupper?

IV. 2. This obſervation will be more cogent, if we conſider, that the ſame phraſeology, uſed by Chriſt of the paſchal cup, Luke xxii. 18. *I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God ſhall come*, is alſo, according to Matth. xxvi. 29. made uſe of concerning the cup at the holy ſupper. Whence we infer, that then Chriſt likewiſe drank of the cup with his diſciples.

V. 3. We may add, that no reaſon can be aſſigned, why Chriſt ſhould not partake of the ſupper, as he did of baptiſm, and conſecrate, in his own perſon, theſe two ſacraments of the New Teſtament.

VI. 4. Nay, this ſeems requiſite from the mutual union between Chriſt and believers, and that intercourſe of intimate familiarity, which, among other things, was ſealed in this myſtical feaſt, and which our Lord himſelf has very elegantly propoſed, under the ſimilitude

* In Hilcot Berachot, c. 7.

of a mutual supper ;* *I will sup with him, and he with me.*

VII. This also was the opinion of the fathers: As of Jerome.† "Not Moses, but the Lord Jesus gave us the true bread: he himself at once the entertainer and the entertainment; the eater and the food." Of Augustine.‡ "And having first tasted the sacrament of his body and blood, he signified his meaning." Of Chrysostom.§ "He also drinks thereof, lest, on hearing his words, they shall say, And do we then drink blood and eat flesh? And therefore, in order to prevent this, he himself sets them an example, &c."

VIII. This use of the sacraments, was not a matter of choice to Christ, but *a part of his righteousness*, and *a duty* incumbent upon him. For he himself declared, when John refused to baptize him, *Suffer it to be so now: for thus* PREPON-ESTIN, *it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.*‖ Where by *righteousness* he means the obedience due to the command of God; and it became both John and Christ, to fulfil *all*, and consequently this part. The part of Christ was to present himself to be baptized by John; and John's duty not to deny Christ in this: thus it became both of them: which in this place does not simply denote a matter of mere *fitness*, as if baptism was a thing unnecessary (it being, as we have already said, a part of the righteousness which Christ was to fulfil;) but it signified every duty incumbent, the performance of which is an ornament to the saints, and renders them beautiful in the eyes of God: as the psalmist sings:¶ *Holiness* NAAVA [is the ornament of] *becometh thine house.* In this sense Paul said, *as* PREPEI, *becometh saints ;*** and HO PREPEI, *which*

* Rev. iii. 20. † In epist. ad. Hedibiam, quæst. 2. ‡ De doctrina Christina, lib. 2. c. 3. § Homil. lxxxiii. in Matth. ‖ Matth. iii. 15. ¶ Psal. xciii. 5. ** Eph. v. 3.

becometh women profeſſing godlineſs;* and *for* EPREPE, *it became him.* The rectitude *(a)* beauty, or comelineſs of God, who is adorned with rectitude and beauty,† CHASIN JAH, (which rectitude he can neither deny, nor act contrary to) required, that the Captain of our ſalvation ſhould be made perfect by ſufferings; *Such a High Prieſt became us.*‡ From which it appears, that the baptiſm of Chriſt was a part of his duty, by which he rendered himſelf comely both in the eyes of God and men.

IX. But beſides this, the ſacraments which Chriſt made uſe of, had ſtill a further reſpect. They are not only to be conſidered as *acts of obedience*, enjoined by the law, but alſo as *ſigns and ſeals of the covenant*, whereby the mutual engagements of the contracting parties are ſealed. For God did not inſtitute the ſacraments with a view, that any ſhould place virtue and holineſs in the bare exerciſe of thoſe acts, but that they might be ſeals of ſpiritual things. Nor does he make a proper uſe of the ſacraments, who does not apply them to that end. And as to Chriſt, we are not to doubt, but that he made uſe of theſe inſtitutions agreeably to the intention of God, who appointed them, as was proper to be done by that moſt perfect and excellent ſervant, in whom God was well pleaſed. There was therefore, in the uſe of the ſacraments, a confirmation of the promiſes, both of thoſe made by the Father to the Son, and by the Son to the Father.

* 1 Tim. ii. 10. Heb. ii. 10. † Pſal. lxxxix. 8. ‡ Heb. vii. 26.

(a) The author here uſes a word of a very general ſignification, ſignifying every thing that is ſuitable to the perfections of God. And as the divine rectitude, holineſs, or righteouſneſs, is his beauty; ſo this, I apprehend, is what the author means here by *decentia Dei.*

X. Moreover, the promiſes made to Chriſt were of various kinds. Some were made to him as a particular *man*, born holy, who was to be juſtified and made happy, upon conſtantly perſevering in the courſe of his commenced purity. For Chriſt was indeed a creature, but holy; now to make a holy creature happy, who preſerves its holineſs untainted, is ſo agreeable to the divine goodneſs, that it is ſcarce, if at all, poſſible, it could be otherwiſe, as we have proved at large, book i. chap. 4. ſect. 12. & ſeq. And theſe promiſes are *legal*, and belong to *the covenant of works*. Other promiſes made to him as *Surety* and *Mediator*, by which his *perſon*, and his *office* and *work*, as Mediator, ſhould be acceptable to God, and very ſucceſsful: and a twofold effect was certainly to enſue, *one for himſelf*, viz. a moſt excellent degree of glory; *the other for the elect*, who were to be united to him, namely, their ſalvation. And theſe laſt are properly the promiſes of the covenant of which we treat, and of which we have given a ſpecimen, book ii. chap. iii. § 29. & ſeq.

XI. We may now inquire, whether both theſe kinds of promiſes were ſealed to Chriſt, by the ordinary ſacraments of the old and New Teſtament, which he partook of. But we muſt not determine any thing raſhly with reſpect to this: and therefore I ſhall modeſtly propoſe, what I think moſt probable. There is, indeed, no reaſon, why Chriſt as a holy man, and who, as ſuch, was to be made happy, might not be confirmed in the faith of this promiſe by ſome certain ſacraments. This appears from the ſacraments of the covenant of works given to Adam before the fall. But that ſuch ſacraments were, for that purpoſe, granted to Chriſt, does not appear from ſcripture. Moreover, I dare not affirm, that the ordinary ſacraments, which Chriſt made uſe of, were ſubſervient to the confirming the legal pro-

miſes, belonging to the covenant of works. The reaſon is, becauſe they are ſacraments of the covenant of grace. And it does not ſeem conſiſtent, that the promiſes of the covenant of works ſhould be ſealed by the ſacraments of the covenant of grace.

XII. I cannot indeed refuſe, that there is a great difference in ſome circumſtances, as to the ſignification of the ſacraments, as made uſe of by Chriſt, and as uſed by believers. For to the latter they ſeal regeneration, the mortification of the old, and the vivification of the new man, the remiſſion of ſins; which as they neither had, nor could have any place in Chriſt, the holy One of God, ſo they could not, in this manner, be ſeals to him. Chriſt alſo, by the ſacraments, engaged to perform obedience otherwiſe than believers do; for he engaged to perform the moſt perfect obedience, without any defect, and bound himſelf to bear the curſe of the law, and that in order to ſatisfy divine juſtice. Believers indeed, in the uſe of the ſacraments, engage to perform ſincere obedience, yet not that which is abſolutely perfect (for that would be to be guilty of a formal lie;) neither do they bind themſelves to bear the curſe, nor promiſe any thing, by which, of themſelves, they may ſatisfy the juſtice of God. So that not all the ſame things, at leaſt not in the ſame manner, were ſealed to Chriſt by the ſacraments, which by theſe are ſealed to believers.

XIII. That very accurate divine, Gomarus, having duly examined theſe things, has preſented us with a certain general ſignification of the ſacraments, which he maintains to have had place in Chriſt. According to him, it was this, namely, *a ſign and ſeal of his covenant with God, and communion with the church, that God ſhould be his God, and the beſtower of ſalvation: and he himſelf bound to perform perpetual, grateful obedience to*

*him, and joined in communion with the church.** Though there is no impropriety in these things, and they were doubtless signified in the sacraments, which Christ made use of, yet they do not seem to come up to the full signification of the sacraments; since the proper, proximate, and principal end, and consequently the very nature of these sacraments, is especially to be a seal of the new covenant. And here holds what is commonly said in the schools, the principal act specifies, as the great Voetius† has accurately observed.

XIV. I therefore conclude, that the promises *made to Christ as Mediator*, were principally sealed to him by the sacraments. Christ indeed obtained these in virtue of his merits, or, to speak with Paul, because he fulfilled the righteousness of the law; yet in themselves, and as they relate to believers, they are promises of the covenant of grace; by which it was declared, that Christ should become the glorious Lord and head of believers, and that they should be redeemed by his satisfaction, justified by his merits, and at length made perfectly happy with him, that so he might for ever exult for joy with them, and in them, as his glorious inheritance.

XV. The justification of the Lord Jesus is contained in these promises, concerning which he himself says, *He is near that justifieth me, who will contend with me? Who is he that shall condemn me?*‡ And Paul, *He was justified in the Spirit.*§ This justification does not only consist in his being declared innocent of those crimes, with which he was falsely accused, and for which he was condemned by men; nor in the Father's declaring him to be holy and righteous, and worthy of his favor, on account of the perfect holiness of his nature and actions; but in his being, as Mediator, declared to have perform-

* In Matth. iii. 13. † Disput. tom. 2. p. 161. ‡ Is. l. 8, 9.
§ 1 Tim. iii. 16.

ed every thing he was bound to for the payment of the debt he had taken upon himself. So that he, who had before appeared *in the likeneſs of ſinful fleſh*,* was now to be ſeen CHORIS HAMARTIAS, *without ſin by thoſe that look for him unto ſalvation.*

XVI. Yet I dare not ſay with a certain divine, in other reſpects very judicious, that the remiſſion of thoſe ſins which Chriſt as Surety took upon himſelf, was ſealed to him. For the ſcripture no where ſpeaks in this manner. Beſides, the remiſſion of ſins is the forbearance or removal of the puniſhment due to them. Which cannot be ſaid of Chriſt, becauſe he ſuffered the puniſhment due to us, and, in the fulleſt manner, ſatisfied the juſtice of God. Our ſins are forgiven us, on account of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt. But neither ſcripture nor reaſon will authoriſe us to ſay, that ſins were forgiven to Chriſt.

XVII. However, agreeably to both it may be ſaid, that the regeneration of the elect, the remiſſion of their ſins, their ſanctification and glorification, in a word, all thoſe benefits, which, by virtue of the covenant of grace, are beſtowed upon them, were promiſed and ſealed to Chriſt by the ſacraments. For ſince, by virtue of the myſtical union, founded on the decree of God, Chriſt and the elect are one ſpiritual body, Chriſt received thoſe gifts in the elect, which are given to them; as we have ſeveral times hinted from Pſal. lxviii. 18.

XVIII. May we not here alſo infer what Paul writes,† that the church is PLEROMA TOU TA PANTA EN PASI PLEROMENOU, *the fulneſs of him that filleth all in all?* Fulneſs, I ſay, not only to be completed by Chriſt, but alſo, in its meaſure, which makes Chriſt complete, who himſelf ſeems not to be completed without his whole body. So that the promiſes made to the

* Rom. viii. 3. † Eph. i. 23.

elect, may so far be looked upon as made to Christ, and thus sealed to him by the sacraments.

XIX. Moreover, Christ, on the other hand, promised the Father, in the use of the sacraments, that he would faithfully and perseveringly perform all he bound himself to by agreement. For, in the use of the sacraments, there is, as it were, a kind of renewal of the covenant, and, if we may thus speak, a repeated solemnisation thereof. Christ therefore, by that act, publicly protested before God and the church, that he would not fail in any part of his duty.

XX. Some perhaps may think, to what purpose is this mutual sealing of the promises by sacraments: for neither was the faith of Christ subject to any vitious flaw of weakness, to render such a confirmation necessary; nor the Father under any doubt as to the fidelity of his engaging Son? But the answer is easy. 1. The institution and use of sacraments do not, from the nature of the thing, presuppose sin, or any weakness of faith. This appears from the sacraments instituted before the fall. They are not therefore to be esteemed a vain institution; for that would be injurious to the wisdom of God, who appointed them. 2. Though the faith of Christ had no stain, yet it was but human, and depended on the influence, support, and corroboration of the Deity: and as he usually does this by the means he has appointed for that purpose, it was the duty of the man Christ, to obey this will of the Deity, and carefully apply the means adapted to that end; some of which are the sacraments. 3. None, I imagine, will deny, that Christ preserved, exerted, and strengthened his own faith by devout prayers, pious meditation on the word of God, an attentive observation of the ways of God towards himself and other believers, contemplation of the divine perfections, and by a full exercise of institut-

ed worſhip. For as theſe are things inſeparable from the duty of a pious man, ſo they very much contribute to preſerve and ſtrengthen faith. Why ſhould we not then believe, that they had the ſame effect on Chriſt, as what, by their nature, they are adapted to have? And if by theſe means the faith of Chriſt was ſupported, why not alſo by the ſacraments? 4. Nay, as often as a more bitter temptation or dreadful affliction aſſaulted him, he was confirmed in the faith of the promiſes by extraordinary means; ſuch as the appearance of God at Jordan, the deſcent of the Holy Spirit,* the miniſtry of angels,† the glorious transfiguration on the holy mountain,‡ a voice from heaven,§ and an angel ſtrengthening him in his agony.‖ From which I conclude, that ſince it was fit, Chriſt ſhould at times be confirmed in faith by extraordinary means, it was nowiſe unfit to allow the ordinary means of the ſacraments to be applied for the ſame purpoſe.

XXI. Nor was it leſs proper, that Chriſt ſhould ſo ſolemnly reiterate his engagements in the uſe of the ſacraments, though the Father was fully perſuaded of his veracity and fidelity. For, 1. That free and often-repeated profeſſion of Chriſt's alacrity to perform every thing he engaged for, contributed to the glory of the Father. 2. The zeal of Chriſt himſelf, though never vitiouſly languid, was yet rouſed and kindled to a flame by that repetition of his obligation. 3. It was highly uſeful to believers, who either were eye-witneſſes of his actions, or otherwiſe acquainted with them, attentively to conſider that open declaration of Chriſt's readineſs. For thus they were both ſtrengthened in the faith of Chriſt, and excited to a like alacrity of zeal. Whence

* Matth. iii. 16, 17. † Matth. iv. 11. ‡ Matth. xvii. 1, &c.
§ John xii. 28. ‖ Luke xx. 43.

we conclude, that the uſe of the ſacraments was neither a vain nor an empty thing to Chriſt.

XXII. Having premiſed theſe things in general concerning the ſacraments which Chriſt uſed, let us briefly take a view of each. And the firſt is his CIRCUMCISION, intimated Luke ii. 21. Which ſignified and ſealed to Chriſt, 1. That he was acknowledged by the Father, as the promiſed ſeed of Abraham, in whom all the nations of the earth were to be bleſſed. 2. That his death and cutting off out of the land of the living,* ſhould be the means of the preſervation and life of his whole myſtical body, as the cutting off of the foreſkin in the Jews, was a mean for the preſervation of the whole perſon. For they who neglected this, were threatened to be cut off from among their people.† 3. That his people were to derive from him the circumciſion made without hands, conſiſting in putting off the body of the ſins of the fleſh, to be begun in regeneration, carried on in ſanctification, and conſummated in the glorification both of body and ſoul.‡

XXIII. On the other hand, Chriſt promiſed in circumciſion, 1. That he would in general perform all righteouſneſs; ſee Gal. v. 3. And, on his coming into the world, he proclaimed this by this ſolemn token, *Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.*§ 2. More eſpecially, that he was ready and prepared to ſhed his blood, and undergo thoſe ſufferings, by which he was under obligation to ſatisfy the juſtice of God. For he entered upon life by undergoing pain and ſhedding his blood on the eighth day. And, 3. Moſt of all, that being now made fleſh of our fleſh,‖ he would willingly, at the appointed time, give himſelf up to death, and to be cut off out of

* If. liii. 8. † Gen. xvii. 14. ‡ Col. ii. 11. § Pſal. xl. 8, 9.
‖ Eph. v. 30.

the land of the living, in order thereby to be the Saviour of his myſtical body.*

XXIV. Of a like nature is the conſideration of the *baptiſm* of Chriſt. In which, 1. The Father openly declared, that he acknowledged the Lord Jeſus for his Son, whoſe perſon and offices were moſt acceptable to him. 2. That Chriſt ſhould be filled with the gifts of the Spirit, not only to be furniſhed with them, in the fulleſt manner, for the executing his office, but for believers to derive abundantly from his fulneſs. This was ſignified both by the water of baptiſm,† and by the ſymbol of the deſcending dove. 3. That, in the appointed time, Chriſt ſhould, by a glorious reſurrection, come out of the waters of tribulation, and lift up his head,‡ as the baptiſed perſon aſcends out of the water. 4. On the other hand, Jeſus declared his readineſs to plunge into the torrents of hell, yet with an aſſured faith and hope of a deliverance.

XXV. In the *paſſover* was ſignified to the Lord Jeſus, 1. His being acknowledged by the Father the Lamb without ſpot or blemiſh, and ſeparate from ſinners. 2. That, by his blood, he was certainly to obtain for believers deliverance from the deſtroying angel, as the Iſraelites in Egypt were delivered by the blood of the paſſover. On the other hand, Jeſus made a declaration of his readineſs to undergo the moſt bitter things for his people, prefigured by the bitter herbs of the paſſover, and to ſhed his blood, and be ſlain and ſcorched in the fire of the divine anger burning againſt our ſins; in a word, to give himſelf wholly for us, as the paſchal lamb was all of it to be conſumed.

* Eph. v. 13. † Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 27. ‡ Pſ. cx. 7. and Pſal. xl. 3.

XXVI. Here I cannot omit what the celebrated Buxtorf has obſerved in the diſſertation above quoted, § 54. that the circumciſion of Chriſt, and his death on the croſs, were very elegantly and exactly prefigured, by the ſlaying of the paſchal lamb. The form is deſcribed in the Talmud, treatiſe on the paſſover, chap. v. in Miſchna, in theſe words: "How do they hang up and excoriate [flay off the ſkin of] the lamb to be ſlain? Iron hooks, or nails, were fixed in the walls and pillars; on which nails they hanged up and flayed the lamb. If, on account of the number of the ſlayers, there was not room enough on the nails, they had recourſe to ſlender ſmooth ſticks; upon one of theſe a perſon took up the lamb, and laid it on his own and his neighbour's ſhoulders; thus they hung up and excoriated the lamb." And much to the ſame purpoſe is what Bochart has remarked in his Hierozoicon, l. ii. c. 5. from Maimondes in his book *de paſch. c.* viii. § 13. "When they roaſt the paſchal lamb, they transfix it from the middle of the mouth to the pudenda, with a wooden ſpit, and placing fire underneath, ſuſpend it in the middle of the oven." In order therefore to roaſt it, they did not turn it on an iron ſpit, in the manner uſed by us, but ſuſpended it transfixed with one made of wood, which in ſome meaſure, repreſented Chriſt hanging on the croſs. Eſpecially, if what Juſtin Martyr mentions is true, in his dialogue with Trypho the Jew. "The roaſted lamb was made into the figure of a croſs, by empaling it from head to tail, and then from one ſhoulder to the other with a ſkewer, on which laſt were extended the fore-feet, and thus it was roaſted." And why may we not give credit to this relation of a man not only pious, but alſo well ſkilled in the Jewiſh cuſtoms, having been born at Sichem, and the ſon of a Samaritan? Since then the paſſover preſented ſuch a clear reſemblance of the crucifix-

ion; Chriſt, when he partook of it, promiſed obedience even unto the croſs.

XXVII. The ſignification of the *holy ſupper* is much the ſame. By it was ſealed to Chriſt, 1. That he ſhould be to the elect the ſweeteſt meat and drink for their ſpiritual and eternal life. 2. That the virtue of his merits ſhould be celebrated by believers, till his return again to judgment. 3. That, together with believers, he ſhould enjoy a heavenly feaſt, never to have an end. But then again, Chriſt promiſed the breaking of his body, and the ſhedding of his blood. And thus in all and each of the ſacraments, which Chriſt made uſe of, there was a ſolemn repetition and a ſealing of the covenant entered into between him and the Father.

THE

OECONOMY

OF THE

DIVINE COVENANTS.

BOOK III.

CHAP. I.

Of the Covenant of God with the Elect.

THE plan of this work, formerly laid down, has now brought us to treat of *God's Covenant with the elect*, founded on the compact between the Father and the Son. The nature of which we shall *first* unfold in general, and *then* more particularly explain it; and that in the following order; as, first, to speak of the *contracting parties;* then inquire into the *promises* of the covenant, and moreover, examine, whether, and what, and how far, any thing may be required of the elect, by way of a *condition* in the covenant: in fine, to debate whether this covenant has its peculiar *threatenings*.

II. The *contracting parties* are, on the one part *God;* on the other, the *elect*. And God is to be considered, 1. As truly *all-sufficient*, for all manner of happiness, not only to himself, nay, nor only to the innocent creature, but also to guilty and sinful man. He himself im-

preſſed this upon Abraham, at the renewal of the covenant, when he emphatically called himſelf EL SHADDAI, *the almighty God*, or God all-ſufficient.* EL denotes *ſtrong*, *powerful*, as Prov. iii. 27. EL JADCHA, *the power of thine hand.* It therefore denotes him, who is endowed with ſuch power, as *that he is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we aſk or think.*† Without whom we can do nothing, and in whom we can do all things. SHADDAI ſignifies *ſufficient*, whether we ſuppoſe it compounded of the relative SHIN, and DAI, ſo as to denote *one who is ſufficient;* or whether derived from SHAD, ſignifying both a pap or breaſt, and *deſolation* or ravage. If we join each of theſe together, we may ſay, that God is ſo powerful and ſo *ſufficient*, as that he himſelf is in want of nothing, and from his *plentiful breaſt* all things derive their being, their life, and their motion: which breaſt being once withdrawn, all things relapſe into *deſolation.* Such he declares himſelf to be to his choſen people, in the covenant of grace, for whoſe benefit he is poſſeſſed of this moſt powerful all-ſufficiency. That name, therefore, is often repeated to the patriarchs, as the fountain of every bleſſing.‡ 2. As moſt *merciful* and *gracious*, rejoicing to communicate himſelf to the ſinful creature.§ 3. And at the ſame time as moſt *juſt*, not entering into a ſtate of friendſhip with the ſinner, but in a way conſiſtent with his holineſs, and after having obtained full ſatisfaction to his juſtice: for *he will by no means clear the guilty.* 4. And laſtly, as moſt *wiſe*, having found out an admirable mixture of his mercy and juſtice, without infringing the rights of either. For by this means, *unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places, is made known by*

* Gen. xvii. 1. † Eph. iii. 20. ‡ Gen. xxviii. 3. xxxv. 11. and xliii. 14. § Exod. xxxiv. 6, 7.

the church HE POLUPOIKILOS SOPHIA TOU THEORE, *the manifold wisdom of God.**

III. But here men are considered, 1. As *sinners*, miserable and lost in themselves, who could not be restored by their own, or by any other created power; in a word, possessed of nothing on account of which they could please God.† 3. As *chosen* by God to grace and glory, according to his most absolute good pleasure, and so appointed heirs of eternal life, constituting that *little flock, to whom it is the Father's good pleasure to give the kingdom.*‡ As those *for whom* Christ engaged, or made satisfaction: for this ought to be considered as necessary, before it could be worthy of God, to make mention of his grace to sinful man.

IV. The œconomy of the persons of the Trinity in this business of the covenant of grace, claims also our attention. The *Father* is held forth as the principal author of it, *who was in Christ, reconciling the world to himself;*§ and has appointed the elect to be heirs of himself, and joint heirs with his Son.‖ The *Son* is not only *Mediator*, and Executor of the covenant, but is himself also *the Testator*, who, by his death, ratified the testament of grace,¶ and the *Distributor* of all the blessings of it; *I give unto them eternal life.*** The *Spirit* brings the elect to Christ, and, in Christ, to the possession of the benefits of the covenant, intimates to their consciences TA HOSIA TOU DABID TA PISTA, *the holy pledges, the sure mercies of David*, and is the seal and earnest of their complete happiness.††

V. Moreover, as we restrict this covenant to the elect, it is evident, we are speaking of the *internal*, mystical,

* Eph. iii. 10. † Ezek. xvi. 1.—6. Tit. iii. 3, 4. ‡ Luke xii. 32. § 2 Cor. v. 19. ‖ Rom. viii. 17. ¶ Luke xxii. 29. Heb. ix. 16. ** John x. 28. †† 1 Cor. xii. 3, 11, 12. Eph. i. 13, 14.

and ſpiritual *communion* of the covenant. For ſalvation itſelf, and every thing belonging to it, or inſeparably connected with it, are promiſed in this covenant, all which none but the elect can attain to. If, in other reſpects, we conſider the *external* œconomy of the covenant, in the communion of the word and ſacraments, in the profeſſion of the true faith, in the participation of many gifts, which, though excellent and illuſtrious, are yet none of the effects of the ſanctifying Spirit, nor any earneſt of future happineſs, it cannot be denied, that, in this reſpect, many are in covenant, whoſe names, notwithſtanding, are not in the teſtament of God.

VI. And thus we have begun to mention ſome things concerning *the promiſes* of the covenant, which, in general, may be included under the names of GRACE and GLORY, as is done by the pſalmiſt,* *The Lord will give* GRACE *and* GLORY. Which are commonly ſo diſtinguiſhed by divines, as to refer grace to this life, and glory to that which is to come: though the grace of this life be glorious, and the glory of the future life gracious. We may likewiſe not improperly ſay, that, in the covenant of grace, are promiſed both ſalvation itſelf, and all the means leading to it, which the Lord hath briefly compriſed in theſe words: *But this ſhall be the covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael; After thoſe days, ſaith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they ſhall be my people.*† And again, *And they ſhall be my people, and I will be their God. And I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them, and of their children after them. And I will make an everlaſting covenant with them, that I will not turn away from*

* Pſal. lxxxiv. 11. † Jer. xxxi. 33.

*them, to do them good; but I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me.**

VII. Here we are to observe a remarkable difference between *the promises of the covenant of works*, and those of *the covenant of grace*. The same eternal life is promised in both, which can be but one, consisting in the communion and enjoyment of God; but it is promised in a manner quite different in the one, from what it is in the other. In the covenant of works God promised life to man, on condition of perfect obedience, but he did not promise to produce or effect this obedience in man. In the covenant of grace, he so promises life eternal, as at the same time to promise faith and repentance, and perseverance in holiness, without which life cannot be attained; and which being granted, life cannot but be obtained. And even in this sense it may be said, that the covenant, of which Christ is the Mediator, is *more excellent, and established on better promises*;† because it does not depend on any uncertain condition, but being founded on the suretiship and actual satisfaction of Christ, does infallibly secure salvation to the believer, and as certainly promise faith to the elect.

VIII. Divines explain themselves differently as to the *conditions* of the covenant of grace. We, for our part, agree with those, who think, that the covenant of grace, to speak accurately, with respect to us, has no conditions, properly so called: which sentiment we shall explain and establish in the following manner.

IX. *A condition* of a covenant, properly so called, is *that action, which, being performed, gives a man a right to the reward.* But that such a condition cannot be required of us in the covenant of grace, is self-evident: because a right to life neither is, nor indeed can

* Jer. xxxii. 38, 39, 40. † Heb. viii. 6.

be, founded on any action of ours, but on the righteousness of our Lord alone; who having perfectly fulfilled the righteousness of the law for us, nothing can, in justice, be required of us to perform, in order to acquire a right, already fully purchased for us. And, indeed, in this all the orthodox readily agree.

X. Further, the apostle, more than once, sets forth the covenant of grace, under the appellation of *a testament*, which is God's immutable purpose, not suspended on any one condition: and as it is founded on the unchangeable counsel of God, and ratified by the death of the Testator, so it is not possible, it should be made void by any unbelief of the elect, nor acquire its stability from any faith of man: seeing in this very testament God has as immutably determined concerning faith, as salvation. Thus, Gal. iii. 15. we see *the covenant* of God with Abraham is called *a testament*; the ratification of which must also be the same with that of a testament. And the covenant to be made with Israel, Jer. xxxi. has the same appellation, Heb. viii. 10. As also that covenant with Israel mentioned by Moses, Exod. xxiv. and the declaration of the manner of enjoying the love of God through faith in Christ, Heb. ix. 15, 20. And likewise, the compact of the Father with the Son, Luke xxii. 39. "In which passage, first, the will of God is published, by which he decreed, that the Son should, by the divine power of the Father, obtain the inheritance of the world, and a kingdom: secondly, the will of Christ, that the apostles, and others given him, should, through faith, become heirs of righteousness, and of the heavenly kingdom, and of that of the world. Compare Gal. iii. 8. But why the apostle should call the covenant of Abraham, and that mentioned, Heb. viii. 10. a *testament*, and whether it ought not to be so taken, Matth. xxvi. 18. and in other places, shall be

conſidered in its place."* And, in a word, I know not whether Paul, when ſpeaking of the covenant of grace, did, at any time, or in any paſſage, give it any other name than that of a teſtament. "But at that time" (at leaſt if we give in to Cocceius's opinion) "that word ſignified, neither to Greeks, nor Helleniſt Jews, nor to the Hebrews any other thing but a teſtament."† I do not produce theſe things, as if I wanted to confound the notions of a covenant and a teſtament; but to ſhew, that the covenant of grace is *teſtamentary*, and to be diſtinguiſhed from a covenant founded on a compact, agreement, or law. Nor do I conceal, that I found this in Cocceius.‡ Which made me wonder, that a certain learned perſon, who is a great admirer of Cocceius, ſhould find fault with theſe things.

XI. The famous Cloppenburg, formerly the ornament of the univerſity of Frieſland, has accurately obſerved the ſame thing; whoſe words I ſhall ſubjoin.§ "The other diſpoſition of the covenant (which regards us) is teſtamentary, whereby the grace, by which we are ſaved, comes to us from the moſt perfect merit of Chriſt the Surety. For we are reckoned to be in covenant with God, by the new covenant of grace, without having ſuperadded to the covenant confirmed with Chriſt, the Surety, by the renewal of the old agreement, any condition, by which God ſhould tranſact with us, but giving a gratuitous call to the inheritance of the promiſes, whoſe teſtament Chriſt ratified by his death, and whoſe Mediator he now is in heaven; namely, of full reconciliation with God and of eternal life." Junius, in like manner.‖ "The conditions being fulfilled by the angel of the covenant, the catholic church was,

* Cocceius de fœder. § 4. † Cocceius ad Gal. iii. § 134. ‡ De fœd. § 87. § Ex diſputat. 3. de fœderibus, theſ. 29. ‖ In theſib. diſputat. 25. § 29.

through and for him, conſtituted heir of eternal life, without any condition."

XII. Beſides, when God propoſes the form of the covenant of grace, his words, to this purpoſe, are mere promiſes, as we have lately ſeen from Jer. xxxi. and xxxii. Our divines therefore, who, in conſequence of the quirks of the Socinians and Remonſtrants, have learned to ſpeak with the greateſt caution, juſtly maintain, that the goſpel, ſtrictly taken, conſiſts of pure promiſes of grace and glory.

XIII. And indeed, if we are to take the promiſes of the covenant of grace altogether without exception, we could not, ſo much as in thought, deviſe any thing in us, as the condition of theſe promiſes. For whatever can be conceived as a condition, is all included in the univerſality of the promiſes. Should God only promiſe eternal life, there might be ſome pretence for ſaying, that repentance, faith, and the like, were the conditions of this covenant. But ſeeing God does, in the ſame breath, as it were ratify both the beginning, progreſs, uninterrupted continuance, and, in a word, the conſummation of the new life; nothing remains in this univerſality of the promiſes, which can be looked upon as a condition of the whole covenant. But we here treat of the condition of the covenant, and not concerning any thing in man, which muſt go before the actual enjoyment of conſummate happineſs.

XIV. It is, however, certain, that God has, in a very wiſe and holy manner, ſo ordered it, that none ſhould come to ſalvation, but in the way of faith and holineſs; and has ſo ranged his promiſes, that none ſhould attain to the more principal or more perfect happineſs, but they who ſhould firſt be made partakers of the preceding promiſes. Whence we gather, that none can take comfort in the infallible hope of happineſs, who

has not sincerely applied himself to the practice of faith and godliness. And as the scripture now and then assures us, that it is impossible for any to please God without faith, or see him without holiness; hence many have been induced to call faith and a new life, the conditions of the covenant: whereas, to speak accurately, and according to the nature of this covenant, they are, on the part of God, the execution of previous promises, and the earnest of future happiness, and, on the part of man, the performance of those duties, which cannot but precede the consummate perfection of a soul delighting in God. Or if we will insist upon it, to call these things *conditions*; they are not so much conditions *of the covenant*, as *of the assurance* that we shall continue in God's covenant, and that he shall be our God. And I make no doubt, but this was exactly the meaning of those very learned divines, though all of them have not so happily expressed themselves.

XV. Let us again hear our own Cloppenburg on this subject, to whose accuracy on this point I have nothing to add.* Nor do *the conditions of the new covenant, enjoined by a law*, adapted thereto, as *repentance, faith*, and *the practice of love to God and our neighbour*, destroy this *evangelical* display of the grace of *the new covenant*, which the testamentary donation, made on account of death, demands. For these conditions of the new covenant are inserted in the testament in such a manner, as to exclude the impenitent, the unbelieving, and the ungodly, from inheriting the promises, but not as if the dispensation and donation of salvation depended on these; or that by our works of obedience to the Lawgiver, we obtain a right to the promise of the inheritance. —What then? Conditions of new obedience are inserted into the testament of the new covenant, under *a legal*

* Disputat. 4. de fœder. thes. 26. § 27.

form indeed, *as the rule of our self-examination*, and of becoming gratitude, leſt, without having the undoubted characters of the ſons of God, we ſhould, without any ground, think ourſelves ſure of the inheritance: yet ſo that repentance itſelf, conſiſting in the mortification of ſin and the practice of good works, is alſo promiſed under *another form*, to wit, as the gift of God, which he himſelf works in us, that, by that ſign or evidence, we may, from the time of our truly repenting and believing, perfectly hope in that grace, which is brought to us at the revelation of Jeſus Chriſt,* having eternal life already begun in ourſelves, together with the new creation of the new ſpiritual life, by the Spirit of God. Thus far Cloppenburg, the accuracy of whoſe diſſertation nothing can exceed.

XVI. We are not to think, that, by this ſentiment, the nature of a covenant is deſtroyed, which conſiſts in *a ſtipulation* and *reſtipulation*. For there is no abſurdity, ſhould we maintain, that that diſpoſition of the new covenant, which was made to the Surety, retained the proper notion of a covenant, ſignifying a compact between two parties of mutual faith; but that the other diſpoſition made *to us*, comes nearer to the form of *a teſtament*, and is rather unilateral, or appointed by one party. Nor is the word BERITH any obſtacle, which we have ſhewn, book i. chap. i. § 3. is of various ſignifications, and often denotes the ſame as CHAK, *a conſtitution*, or ſignifies a certain promiſe, though not mutual.

XVII. Moreover, God, by a certain wonderful act of condeſcenſion, publiſhes the promiſes of his grace to his covenant-people, in this manner; to ſhew that it is his will, that they ſeek for, and expect from him, what he promiſes, juſt as if it was a promiſe of reward, and proceeded from covenant and agreement, and was irre-

* 1 Pet. i. 13.

vocable, on the account of the right of him, who sues for the performance of it. Which is, indeed, an astonishing degree of the Lord's goodness; nevertheless, we are not to use it as an argument for conditions of the covenant of grace, properly so called.

XVIII. But, which is the principal thing, we imagine, the best way to conceive of this constitution of the covenant, is as follows: The covenant of grace, or the gospel, strictly so called, which is the model of that covenant, since it consists in mere promises, prescribes nothing properly as duty, requires nothing, commands nothing: not even this, Believe, trust, hope in the Lord, and the like. But it declares, sets forth, and signifies to us, what God promises in Christ, what he would have done, and what he is about to do. All prescription of duty belongs to the law, as, after others, the venerable Voetius has very well inculcated.* And we are by all means, to maintain this, if, with the whole body of the reformed, we would constantly defend the perfection of the law, which comprehends all virtues, and all the duties of holiness. But the law, adapted to the covenant of grace, and, according to it, inscribed on the heart of the elect, enjoins to receive all those things which are proposed in the gospel, with an unfeigned faith, and frame our lives suitably to that grace and glory which are promised. When God, therefore, in the covenant of grace, promises faith, repentance, and consequently eternal life, to an elect sinner; then the law, whose obligation can never be dissolved, and which extends to every duty, binds the man to assent to that truth, highly prize, ardently desire, seek and lay hold on those promised blessings. Moreover, since the admirable providence of God has ranged the promises in such order, as that faith and repentance go before, and

* Disput. tom. 4. p. 24. & seq.

salvation follows after, man is bound, by the same law, to approve of, and be in love with, this divine appointment, and assure himself of salvation only according to it. But when a man accepts the promises of the covenant, in the order they are proposed, he does, by that acceptance, bind himself to the duties contained in the foregoing promises, before he can assure himself of the fulfilment of the latter. And in this manner the covenant becomes mutual. God proposes his promises in the gospel in a certain order. The man, in consequence of the law, as subservient to the covenant of grace, is bound to receive the promises *in that order*. While faith does this, the believer, at the same time, binds himself to the exercise of a new life, before ever he can presume to entertain a hope of eternal life. And in this manner it becomes a mutual agreement.

XIX. But let none here object, that life is promised in the new covenant, to him that believes and repents, no less than it was, in the old covenant, to him that worketh; in order thence to conclude, that faith and repentance are now, in the same manner, conditions of the covenant of grace, that perfect obedience was the condition of the covenant of works. For when life is promised to him that doth any thing, we are not directly to understand a condition, properly so called, as the cause of claiming the reward. God is pleased only to point out the way we are to take, not to the right, but to the possession of life. He proposes faith as the instrument, by which we lay hold on the Lord Jesus, and on his grace and glory; good works, as the evidences of our faith and of our union with Christ, and as the way to the possession of life.

XX. But we must not forget to observe, that faith has quite a different relation with respect to the blessings of the covenant of grace, from what the other works of

the new life have. In this, indeed, they agree, that both conjointly are the way to the promiſed bliſs; but faith has ſomething peculiar. For as faith is an aſſipulation, or aſſent given to the divine truth, it includes in it the acceptance of the benefit offered by the covenant, and makes the promiſe firm and irrevocable. "Here is my Son," ſays God, "and ſalvation in him. I offer him to whoever deſires him, and believes, that he ſhall find his ſalvation in him. Who deſires him? who believes this?" "I do," ſays the believer, "I greatly long for him. I believe my ſalvation to be laid up in him. I take him as thus offered to me." "Be it ſo," ſaith the Lord. And in this manner the promiſe is accepted, the truth of God ſealed, the donation of Chriſt, and of ſalvation in him, becomes irrevocable. From all which it is evident, that faith has a quite different relation in the new covenant, from what works formerly had in the old. What the difference is between *giving* and *receiving*, ſuch ſeems to be the difference between a condition of works and of faith: which the celebrated Hoornbeck has not unhappily explained in Socin. confut. tom. ii. p. 280.

XXI. Let us now laſtly conſider the *threatenings*, whether there be any ſuch in this covenant. It cannot indeed be denied, but that, in the doctrine of Chriſt and the apoſtles, we frequently meet with very many comminations, which have their peculiar reſpect to the covenant of grace, and which could not have thus been ſet before us, if there had been no ſuch covenant. For inſtance, *Whoſoever ſhall not believe in Chriſt, whoever ſhall deſpiſe the counſel of God againſt his own ſoul, whoever ſhall not obey the goſpel ſhall be condemned.* And theſe threatenings ſeem to be diſtinguiſhed from thoſe which are evidently *legal*; ſuch as the following: *Cur-*

fed is he that continueth not in all things, &c. Yet, if we would weigh the matter narrowly, the covenant of grace has no threatenings so peculiar to itself, but what may well be referred to the law, from which every curse proceeds.

XXII. Which I would explain thus: We no where hear of any threatenings, which may and ought not to be deduced from that threatening, which doubtless is purely legal, *Curfed is every one that continueth not in all things*, &c. In this most general threatening are included the other more particular ones. Moreover, when salvation by Christ alone is proposed, in the covenant of grace, as the principal truth, the law, which enjoins man to embrace every truth made known to him by God, with a firm faith, obliges him to receive this truth in particular, and be delighted with the glory of God shining forth in it, and that his own salvation is connected with the glory of God. Should we deny, that the law lays us under this obligation, we should then affirm, that the law does not enjoin us to acknowledge God as true, and that there is a holy love of God, and of ourselves, which the law does not command; all which are most absurd. I go further: When man, as the law prescribes, receives the truth of the gospel with a lively faith, then, not the law, but the gospel, promises salvation to him. For the law knows of no other promise, than what depends on the condition of perfect obedience. But should man slight and obstinately reject that truth proposed to him, he sins against the law, and so incurs its curse, according to the general rule so often inculcated. And since we have supposed the gospel declaring, that salvation flows from the faith of Christ alone, the law enjoins, that all who desire salvation, should seek it by the faith of Christ alone; and consequently it cannot but thunder the curse against those, who, reject-

ing the goſpel, believe not on Chriſt. As therefore unbelief, or the rejecting of the goſpel, is a ſin againſt the law, which is the only perfect rule of all virtue (it can be called a ſin againſt the goſpel, only objectively;) ſo every threatening of the curſe and of wrath againſt unbelievers, and the deſpiſers of the goſpel, muſt come from, and be reduced to the law, but then it is to the law, as now ſubſervient to the covenant of grace.

XXIII. In the diſcourſes of the prophets, Chriſt and his apoſtles, there is a certain mixture of various doctrines, which indeed are cloſely connected, and mutually ſubſervient; each of which ought to be reduced to their proper heads, ſo that the promiſes of grace be referred to the goſpel, all injunctions of duty, and all threatenings againſt tranſgreſſors, to the law.

CHAP. II.

Of the ONENESS *of the Covenant of Grace, as to its Subſtance.*

IT is a matter of the higheſt moment, that we learn diſtinctly to conſider the covenant of grace, either as it is in its *ſubſtance* or eſſence, as they call it, or as it is diverſely propoſed by God, with reſpect to *circumſtantials*, under different œconomies. If we view *the ſubſtance* of the covenant, 'tis but only *one*, nor is it poſſible it ſhould be otherwiſe. There is no other way worthy of God, in which ſalvation can be beſtowed on ſinners, but that diſcovered in the goſpel. Whence the apoſtle has beautifully ſaid, *'that there is not another goſpel.'** And that teſtament, which was confecrated by

* Gal. i. 7.

the blood of Chriſt, he calls *everlaſting*,* becauſe it was ſettled before all ages, publiſhed immediately upon the fall of the firſt man, conſtantly handed down by the ancients, more fully explained by Chriſt himſelf and his apoſtles, and is to continue throughout all periods of time, and, in virtue of which, believers ſhall inherit eternal happineſs. But if we attend to *the circumſtances* of the covenant, it was diſpenſed *at ſundry times, and in divers manners*, under various œconomies, for the manifeſtation of the manifold wiſdom of God. Concerning this ſubject we ſhall treat in the following chapters, in ſuch a manner, as, firſt, to diſcourſe on thoſe *general things*, which appertain to the *ſubſtance* of the covenant, and have continued in every age; and then explain the different *œconomies*, or diſpenſations, and the new acceſſions made to each. This we will, firſt, do in a general and conciſe manner, in this and the following chapter; then gradually deſcend to the more ſpecial conſiderations.

II. We therefore maintain, agreeably to the ſacred writings, that to all the elect, living in any period of time, 1. *One* and the ſame *eternal life* was promiſed. 2. That Jeſus Chriſt was held forth as the *one* and the ſame *author* and beſtower of *ſalvation*. 3. That they could not become partakers of it any other way, but by a true and lively *faith* in him. If we ſhall demonſtrate theſe three things, none can any longer doubt, but that the covenant of grace muſt be, as to its ſubſtance, only one from the beginning. For if the ſalvation be the ſame, the author of it the ſame, and the manner of communion not different, the covenant itſelf will certainly be one.

III. The ſcriptures ſo evidently declare, that eternal life was promiſed to the elect from the beginning, that

* Heb. xiii. 20.

it is aſtoniſhing any perſons under the chriſtian name ſhould venture to deny it; who, indeed, are much blinder than the Jews themſelves; of whom our Lord teſtifies, *Ye do ſearch the ſcriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life.** And that they were neither raſh nor erroneous in thinking that the promiſes of eternal life, and the manner of enjoying them, were contained in the ſcriptures which they had, we prove by the moſt cogent arguments. 1. Becauſe not only the Lord Jeſus does not by the leaſt hint charge them, in this reſpect, with the ſmalleſt error, but makes uſe of that as a reaſon to recommend to them the ſearch of the ſcriptures. Now, it is very inconſiſtent with the great ſincerity of the Lord Jeſus, and the divine dignity of the ſcriptures, to recommend them by arguments not genuine, or to recommend their value and uſefulneſs from Jewiſh forgeries. Nay, had the Jews falſely perſuaded themſelves, that the promiſes of eternal life were contained in the Old Teſtament records, our Lord ought not, by any conceſſion, to have cheriſhed that prejudice, which would have hindered them from acknowledging the excellence of his doctrine, and conſequently the divinity of his perſon. But it would have been better to have exclaimed againſt them; "In vain do you ſearch the ſcriptures, in hopes of finding eternal life in them; attend rather to me and my doctrine, who am the firſt that came into the world as a preacher of eternal life." But every one may ſee, how inconſiſtent this was with the deſign of the Lord Jeſus. 2. To this we add, that Paul joins his hope as founded on the law and the prophets, with the expectation of the Jews: *Believing all things, which are written in the law and the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themſelves alſo allow, that*

* John v. 39.

*there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.** He testifies, that the Jews expected a resurrection of the dead: he professes to have the same belief and hope with them; and that he did not do so, resting on a vain presumption, but on the law and the prophets, which they also, in their manner, carefully read, and from which they had derived the same expectation with him. 3. The Jews were so far from judging amiss in this respect, that, on the contrary, the Lord Jesus reproved the Sadducees, as ignorant of the scriptures, because from them they had not learned eternal life and the resurrection.†

IV. But let us argue from the very books of the Old Testament; and first, after the example of our Lord, who speaks to this purpose: *But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.*‡ This inference appeared so evident to the very multitude, that they were astonished at his doctrine, and the Sadducees mouth was stopt.§ And indeed, if the words of Moses, quoted by Christ, be accurately weighed, the evidence of this argument will easily appear to the attentive reader.

V. For, 1. That expression, *to be a God to any*, taken in its full import, includes life eternal. For when God becomes the sinner's God, he then becomes to him what he is to himself. But what is he to himself? Doubtless, the fountain of eternal and complete blessedness. When God, out of his grace, gives himself to man, he gives him all things; for himself is all things.

* Matth. xxiv. 14, 15. † Matth. xxii. 29. ‡ Ib. 32. 32.
§ Ver. 33, 34.

Such a man finds in God *a ſhield* againſt every evil, and an *exceeding great reward.** And what can he deſire more in order to his perfect happineſs? Whence the apoſtle joins theſe two,† *God to be the God of any one, and to have prepared for them a city.* And ſeeing *the gifts of God's grace*, eſpecially when he gives himſelf, *are without repentance*,‡ hereby alſo the eternity of this happineſs is eſtabliſhed.

VI. 2. Moreover, this covenant is not made with the ſoul, but with the man; and God not only requires the worſhip of the ſoul, but alſo the ſubmiſſion of the body, as Redeemer of both, in order to his being glorified in both; as he alſo appointed a ſign of his covenant to be in the body.§ Conſequently, when he calls himſelf the God of the whole man, he promiſes his ſalvation not to the ſoul alone, but to the body alſo.

VII. 3. Theſe conſiderations will be more cogent, if we reflect, that the words, from which our Lord argues, were ſpoken of the patriarchs, who had been dead long before.‖ But as God is not the God of perſons who have no exiſtence, it was firſt evident, that their ſouls ſurvived, and enjoyed the beatific viſion of God; and ſince, as we have juſt ſaid, their body alſo was comprehended in the covenant, it followed, that, at the appointed time, their very body, when raiſed from the duſt, ſhould be reunited to the ſoul, in order to partake of the ſame happineſs.

VIII. 4. To be the God of any one ſignifies, in the uſual ſtyle of ſcripture, deliverance from enemies; compare Pſal. iii. 7, 8. Now, death is our greateſt and laſt enemy.¶ As therefore God delivers thoſe whoſe God he is, out of the hand of their enemies, he cannot

* Gen. xv. 1. † Heb. xi. 16. ‡ Rom. xi. 29. § Gen. xvii. 13. ‖ Exod. iii. 6. ¶ 1 Cor. xv. 26.

be the God of thofe who always remain under the power of death: but all who have him for their God, muft neceffarily, after death is fwallowed up, exultingly fing that fong of triumph, *O death! where is thy victory?*

IX. 5. It is beyond all controverfy, that God promifed to thofe illuftrious patriarchs, when he called himfelf their God, fomething highly excellent, and by which they were to be peculiarly diftinguifhed above others, who were not fo eminent in the fervice of God. But they obtained nothing fo very diftinguifhing above other men, in this world, that could equal the greatnefs of this promife. Many wicked men lived more happily in the land of Canaan, and elfewhere. It remains then, that thefe things regard concerns of a fuperior nature, and belong to eternal life in heaven.

X. 6. And laftly, If we are benefactors to any here for the fake of another, we will much more do good to him, if it is in our power. Now, God wants no power. And he declares he will be a benefactor to the pofterity, for the fake of Abraham, Ifaac, and Jacob: much more than he is, and will be a benefactor to themfelves. But they could not be capable of receiving any good, if they did not exift; nor of the higheft benefit, if they were for ever to be under the dominion of death. It therefore follows, that, when thefe words were fpoken, their fouls were in being, and, at the time appointed, were to be reftored to life, that God in a diftinguifhing manner might be their benefactor. All thefe things are deduced from the words of Mofes by no ftrained conſequence.

XI. What Volkelius fays is to no purpofe, when, being pinched by this paffage, he requires us* to produce teftimonies, in which *this benefit is promifed to us*

* Lib. iii. c. 11.

[viz. in the Old] *in as clear and evident terms*, as in the New Teſtament; for he refuſes, that the paſſage we are now treating of, can, on any account, be of that number; as appears from this, that "before Chriſt explained it, none ever ventured ſo much as to ſuſpect it contained any ſuch thing. For it is not credible, that the Phariſees, who were very well ſkilled in the divine law, and who, as it ſeems, frequently and warmly diſputed with the Sadducees about the reſurrection of the dead, would have paſſed over this place in ſilence, if they had imagined it to contain a teſtimony to that purpoſe."

XII. All this is trifling. For, 1. The queſtion is not, whether the teſtimonies concerning eternal life are expreſſed in ſuch plain and clear words in the Old Teſtament as in the New, which none of us affirm, who own that theſe œconomies differ exceedingly in the degrees of their clearneſs: but whether any teſtimonies at all, concerning eternal life, are to be found in the Old Teſtament; which the heretics obſtinately deny. For Volkelius, at the beginning of the ſame chapter, ſays, *It appears, that that promiſe* (of eternal life) *was not at all made in that old covenant.* How unfair then is it to require us to produce ſuch plain and clear teſtimonies?

XIII. 2. He is of a different opinion from Chriſt, in commending the Phariſees for being very ſkilful in the divine law, who reproves them,* as *blind and fooliſh guides*, and charges them with taking away the key of knowledge:† and of whom Paul teſtified, *a vail was upon their heart, that, in reading Moſes and the Old Teſtament, they did not underſtand.*‡

XIV. 3. And we are not much concerned after what manner, or from what topics, they formerly argued;

* Matth. xxiii. 16, 17. † Luke xi. 52. ‡ 2 Cor. iii. 14, 15.

ſince it appears, that Chriſt, which impudence itſelf will not dare to deny, reaſoned judiciouſly. Nor will our adverſary be able in any manner to prove, that they never argued from this paſſage. For who has given us a hiſtory of all their diſputations?

XV. 4. Whatever it be with the Phariſees, certainly, of the ancient Jews, Philo ſeems to have had ſomething like this in his mind; whoſe words the illuſtrious Grotius, a name nowiſe unacceptable to our adverſaries, adduces* to this purpoſe: "To ſay, that God is eternal, is the ſame as to ſay he is one, who beſtows grace, not at ſome certain times only, but inceſſantly at all times." The celebrated Lightfoot† has obſerved, that our Lord's argument would appear with greater evidence, if compared with the mind and doctrine of the Jews. For Rabbi Simeon Ben Jochai ſaid, "The bleſſed and holy God does not put his name on the righteous who are alive, but on thoſe who are dead. As it is ſaid, Pſal. xvi. 3. *to the ſaints that are in the earth.* When are they ſaints? When they are laid in the earth. For the holy and bleſſed God does not put his name upon them, all the days they live. Why ſo? Becauſe the holy and bleſſed God does not confide in them, as if they could not be turned away from the right path by evil affections: but when they are dead, the holy and bleſſed God puts his name upon them." See Tanchum on Gen. xxviii. and Menachem on Exod. iii. Which comes to this purpoſe, that God, in a far more excellent manner, is ſaid to be the God of thoſe who are dead, than of thoſe who ſtill live in a mortal body. And what reaſon can poſſibly be aſſigned for this, but that the ſeparate ſoul enjoys a more excellent life? Aben

* In commentariis ſuis in Matth. xxii. 32. † Spicilegia in Exodum, § 5.

Ezra, among the moderns, had the same view of this, who* explains those words, *I am the Lord thy God*, as containing a promise of *life in both worlds*. And Menasse Ben Israel† uses our Lord's very argument.

XVI. What can be more evident than that testimony, by which the apostle recommends the faith of Abraham? *He looked for a city, which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God*:‡ adding as to the other patriarchs, *For they that say such things, declare plainly that they seek a country*;§ *but now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly*.‖ To pervert these things to a bare expectation, and a vain persuasion, *founded only on conjectures*, as Samalcius expresses it, is doing an injury to these pious heroes, and contradicting Paul, who in this matter celebrates their faith. But it would not have been a faith founded on the word of God alone, but a culpable temerity, to hope for so great things to themselves, without a promise from God. Franzius¶ uses here a most excellent climax or gradation. "How could they have hoped, had they not believed? How could they have believed, what they had not heard? How could they have heard, unless it had been preached to them? But how could any have preached to them, had not God sent them for that purpose, and expressly commanded them to preach this very thing? As the apostle of the Gentiles** argues in a like case."

XVII. But lest they should cavil, that we borrow our arguments only from the New Testament (tho' none can better instruct us in the contents of the Old Testament than Christ and his apostles) come let us consider some passages of the Old Testament, and free them

* Ad Levit. xviii. 4. † De resurrect. mortuor. lib. 1 c. 10.
‡ Heb. xi. 10. § Ver. 14. ‖ Ver. 16. ¶ Disput. 7. thes. 55.
** Rom. x.

from the misconstructions of our adversaries. And first we have that swan-like song of Jacob,* LISHUNGATH CHA HIVVITHI JEHOVAH *I wait for thy salvation, O Lord.* The aged prophet was now at the point of death; and being full of the Spirit of God, he, in the midst of his prophecies, in which he foretells what was to befal his children and latest posterity, breaks out into these words; which were not spoken without the Spirit of God, so as with Samalcius to be referred to a vain persuasion, nor possibly to be wrested to any other, but this spiritual and eternal salvation.

XVIII. Here again, let a person of the Jewish nation put the followers of Socinus, if possible, to the blush: in opposition to whom we produce this paraphrase of the Jerusalem Targumist. "Our father Jacob said, My soul does not expect the redemption of Gideon, the son of Joaz, that being only momentary; nor the redemption of Samson, because a transient redemption; but the redemption thou hast mentioned in thy word, or by thy word, which is to come to thy people, the children of Israel; my soul, I say, expects this thy redemption." Is not this a very clear testimony of the most certain persuasion and the fullest assurance of their salvation?

XIX. Nor must we pass by the celebrated passage of Job,† where, in very clear terms, he declares his belief of a future resurrection; *For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he will stand at the latter day* [*over the dust*] *upon the earth. And though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another, though my reins be consumed within me.* On this confession of faith I would make the following remarks.

* Gen. xlix. 18. † Chap. xix. 25, 26, 27.

XX. 1. That it is something very great, that Job here treats of, appears both from the sacred loftiness and majesty of the style, and the preface with which he ushers them in; namely, his earnest desire, that these his words *might be written and printed in a book, and graven with an iron pen and lead in the rock for ever.* And nothing was more becoming such a desire than the profession of his faith in the Messiah, and his hope of a blessed resurrection.

XXI. 2. Job clears his innocence against the accusations of his friends, who condemned him as *a wicked person*, and one *who did not acknowledge the strong God.** "I am so far," says he, "from being such as you reproachfully represent me, that, on the contrary, being fully possessed of the hope of the righteous, I know both God and my Redeemer, and expect greater blessings at his hands than can be contained within the compass of this world." This indeed was far more powerful to silence the accusations of his friends, than if he had harangued concerning some extraordinary happiness in this life.

XXII. 3. He speaks of a thing he was certain of, and which therefore ought to be built on the infallible promise of God. But it does not appear, that any promise was made him of being restored, in this life, to his former state. Nor are there any general promises, from which this could be certainly concluded. Nay, there are not a few things which persuade us, that Job had no such expectation. For he wishes,† *that it would please God to grant him the thing he longed for*, that is, death, *and to destroy him.* For, says he, *what is my strength, that I should hope out? or what is mine end, that I should prolong my life?*

* Job xviii. 21. † Job vi. 8, 9, 11. and vii. 7, 8.

XXIII. 4. All the words of the text direct us to the bleſſed reſurrection to happen to believers in Chriſt. He ſpeaks of his *Goel*, who, as the redeemer of believers, and, as Theodotion tranſlates it, their next of kin, had the right of conſanguinity to redeem them. He declares, that he *liveth*, being the *true God*, and *eternal life*,* and who has taught us to reaſon from his life to our own; *Becauſe I live, ye ſhall live alſo.*† Though he was really once to die, nevertheleſs he ſays, *I am he that liveth, and was dead, and behold I am alive forevermore.*‡ And this is what Job adds, *He ſhall ſtand, at the latter day, upon the earth* [*over the duſt.*] After having triumphed over all his enemies, he will manifeſt himſelf in the field of battle both alive and a conqueror: or, he ſhall ſtand upon the earth, or over the duſt, the receptacle of death, as an enemy proſtrate under his feet; as 1 Cor. xv. 26, 27. *The laſt enemy that ſhall be deſtroyed, is death. For he has put all things under his feet.* He conſidered this reſurrection of Chriſt, as an earneſt of his own. *And though after my ſkin, worms deſtroy this body*, which he pointed to with his finger, *yet in my fleſh ſhall I ſee God*, namely, *that great God and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, at that time to be manifeſted in his glory.§ Whom he was to ſee *for himſelf*, for his own ſalvation and conſummate joy; in like manner alſo, as David foretold, *As for me, I will behold thy face in righteouſneſs; I ſhall be ſatisfied, when I awake, with thy likeneſs.*‖ This viſion therefore was different from that, of which he ſpeaks chap. xlii. 5, 6. which affected him with grief, and humbled him to duſt and aſhes. Nor was it poſſible, but ſuch a firm hope of ſo great happineſs muſt excite an ardent longing after the enjoy-

* 1 John v. 20. † John xiv. 19. ‡ Rev. i. 18.
§ 1 John iii. 2. ‖ Pſal. xvii. 15.

ment of it. And this is what he adds, *my reins are consumed*, that is, are wasted and languish through my longing (see the signification of this word CALTHA, Psal. lxxxiv. 2. and cxix. 81.) *within me.* In the same manner also as the apostle ardently longed *to know the power of Christ's resurrection; if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.** All these things most exactly agree with Job's design, with the force and magnificence of the style, with the whole tenor of scripture, and, was it not for prejudices, could never be perverted to any other meaning.

XXIV. We therefore conclude in the words of Jerome to Pammachius, concerning the error of John of Jerusalem. "What is more evident than this prophecy? None after Christ speaks so plainly of the resurrection, as he before Christ."

XXV. Let us subjoin the prophecy of Daniel;† *And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.* On this place I observe these following things: 1. That a general resurrection of all, and among these, of the righteous, to life eternal, can scarce be described in more evident terms. Indeed, under the New Testament, the Lord Jesus, speaking of this very mystery, uses almost the very same words, John v. 28, 29. I appeal to any conscience, had Daniel been appointed to prophesy of the resurrection of the dead, whether he could have described it in clearer language?

XXVI. 2. It is no objection, that Daniel says, *many* of them that sleep, shall be raised. For not to mention, that *many* sometimes signifies the same thing as *all* (as Rom. v. 15. compared with 12.) it is evident, that

* Phil. iii. 10, 11. † Chap. xii. 2.

Daniel divides the whole collective body of those that sleep in the dust of the earth, into two classes, one of which shall rise again to life, the other to shame.

XXVII. 3. And this most august prophesy cannot be explained to signify nothing but a temporal and corporal deliverance from the oppression of Antiochus. For how did transgressors rise out of the dust after Antiochus, seeing they were then rather dead, and rendered contemptible? For, during the life of Antiochus, they even flourished. And how were the pious and persevering delivered *to eternal life*, for they all doubtless died again? Will you affirm with Volkelius, that this is to be understood of those, "who constantly adhered to the law of God, and to whom that deliverance was to turn to an eternal glory?" Then, I say, we have an evident promise of eternal life in the books of the Old Testament: which is what we contend for. But if we allow eternal glory to have been promised to them, why not too the resurrection of the dead, which precedes consummate glory?

XXVIII. 4. Nor ought it to be urged, that these things agree not with the time of which Daniel prophesied, namely, the tyranny of Antiochus, and the deliverance therefrom. For should we grant, that Daniel speaks, in the verses immediately preceding, of Antiochus, yet it does not follow, that he could not, in this speak of the resurrection of the dead. For the prophet was here shewing, that God, after having displayed so illustrious an instance of his glorious power, would proceed in the extraordinary deliverances of his people, till all should terminate in the happy resurrection of the dead. If you insist, that the things here foretold, were to exist at *that time*, about which he had hitherto been speaking; I answer, first, that this is not in the text. This verse, indeed, is connected with the foregoing by

the particle, VAU *and*, where the words concerning *that time* are found. But nothing is more frequent in the prophets, than thus to join two things, which are to exist at very different times: of which we have unexceptionable instances, Matth. xxiv. It has likewise been observed by very learned men, that the particle VAU sometimes signifies *at length*, or *afterwards*. Secondly, it may also be said, that UBANGETH HAHI denotes *after that time*: as Jos. v. 5. BETZETHAM signifies *after they came forth*. And the promise of the resurrection ought not to be thought a thing foreign to the times of Antiochus: because it is certain, that they who continued steadfast in the ways of piety, might comfort themselves by that hope, under all their dreadful torments, as may be seen, 2 Maccab. vii. 6, 11, 14. and Heb. xi. 34.

XXIX. But nothing hinders us, with very excellent expositors, to refer the things which Daniel prophesies of towards the close of the chapter, to the New-Testament Antichrist, or to the Roman emperors subservient to Antichrist in promoting the mystery of iniquity. Cunradus Graserus has very learnedly handled this sentiment in a peculiar treatise. And thus the resurrection of the dead would be joined with the destruction of Antichrist, as is likewise done Rev. xx. 10, 13.

XXX. This being the case, we may justly be surprised, that a person, in other respects very learned, and orthodox in the main of this inquiry, could not find the general resurrection of the just in the second verse, when he could find, in the first, the wars of the English with the Dutch, of the Danes with the Swedes, of the Tartars in China, and of the Chinese in Florida, of the Portuguese with the Castilians, and a great many other things of a modern date. But let these things suffice to

ſhew, that, even under the Old Teſtament, eternal life was promiſed to believers.

XXXI. Our writers have diſtinctly anſwered whatever heretics have advanced to the contrary. The whole comes to this: When the apoſtle* calls *the promiſes* of the New Teſtament *better*, that may be underſtood in various reſpects. If referred to eternal life, it does not regard ſo much the thing promiſed, as the plainneſs and certainty of the promiſe; which is not now wrapt up in certain obſcure words, ſhadows, and ceremonies, but diſtinctly propoſed; does not depend on ſome uncertain condition, but in the fulleſt manner, is confirmed by the blood of the teſtator. The apoſtle himſelf ſuggeſts this anſwer, ver. 9, 10.

XXXII. When it is ſaid, that *Chriſt hath aboliſhed death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the goſpel*,† it cannot be underſtood of the firſt promiſe of eternal life, unleſs any ſhall ſay, that it was not made before the reſurrection of Chriſt, which is what is here ſpoken of. But none will ſay ſo. The plain meaning is, that the Lord Jeſus, being riſen from the dead, ſhewed to the whole world, both Jews and Gentiles, to whom the goſpel was preached, that he was the true author of life and immortality: namely, on his coming forth out of the grave, the light of this truth was very widely diffuſed, even among thoſe who before ſat in darkneſs, and in the ſhadow of death.

XXXIII. When the ſame apoſtle affirms, that *our ſalvation at the firſt began to be ſpoken by the Lord*,‡ it is clear, he ſpeaks of the goſpel completed, and of the Meſſiah, the author of ſalvation, already exhibited; which goſpel the Lord firſt publiſhed, with reſpect to the apoſtles, evangeliſts, and the other ordinary preach-

* Heb. viii. 6. † 2 Tim. i. 10. ‡ Heb. ii. 3.

ers, that followed him. For otherwiſe who can deny, that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptiſt, and Mary the mother of our Lord, and the angels who proclaimed his nativity, and the aged Simeon, and John the Baptiſt, were preachers of ſalvation before the Lord? Of the fathers the apoſtle himſelf affirms, that they were EUAGGELISMENOI, *goſpelliſed*, or that *the goſpel was preached unto them as well as unto us.**

XXXIV. When it is written, *that the way unto the holieſt of all was not yet made manifeſt, while as the firſt tabernacle was yet ſtanding:*† the apoſtle indeed intimates, that the manner of obtaining ſalvation was in ſome meaſure hid, in compariſon of the brighter luſtre of the goſpel. For then, doubtleſs, the way to life was clouded with much pomp of ceremonies and figures: which being now diſpelled, we behold with open face, and ardently deſire, heavenly and ſpiritual things. But from this it nowiſe follows, that the ancients had no knowledge of ſalvation; any more than it can be concluded, that we know nothing of our glorious ſtate, becauſe John ſays, *It doth not yet appear what we ſhall be.*‡ We may almoſt, in the ſame manner, anſwer the other objections advanced by our adverſaries. But it is no part of our deſign to examine each in particular.

XXXV. Now let us proceed to the *ſecond thing*, which we undertook to prove; that *in Chriſt*, and in virtue of his ſuretiſhip, the ancients alſo obtained ſalvation even as we. Which Peter declares almoſt in ſo many words, *But we believe, that, through the grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we ſhall be ſaved even as they.*§ Where the pronoun *they* is to be referred to the fathers, on whoſe neck an unſupportable yoke of ceremonies was put, as appears both from the grammatical conſideration

* Heb. iv. 2. † Heb. ix. 8. ‡ 1 John iii. 2. § Acts xv. 11.

of the gender, from the connection, and the force of the apoſtle's argument. For ſince ΚΑΚΕΙΝΟΙ is maſculine, and ΤΑ ΕΘΝΑ, *the Gentiles*, mentioned ver. 7. is neuter, it is not ſo properly referred to the Gentiles, as to *the fathers*. And we are not here, without neceſſity, to have recourſe to an enallage of gender. And then too, what method of commenting is it, to imagine ſo wide an hyperbaton, or tranſpoſition, and to bring from ver. 7. a noun, to which, after the interpoſition of ſo many other things, a pronoun ſhall at length anſwer in ver. 11. and which yet does not anſwer; becauſe, in the words immediately preceding, you may find a noun, with which the pronoun in queſtion may be very well joined? In fine, it will either be nonſenſe, or very inſipid, if the words be ſo conſtrued. For what manner of reaſoning is it, if we ſuppoſe the apoſtle to have ſaid, "The yoke of ceremonies ought not to be put on the necks of the Gentiles, becauſe we Jews and apoſtles believe, that we ſhall be ſaved in the ſame manner as they, by the alone grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt?" For beſides that it was improper to propoſe the Gentiles to the Jews and apoſtles as a pattern of ſalvation, ſince it appears, that the contrary ſhould be done; this only could be concluded from that poſition, that the apoſtles and Jews were not bound to circumciſion, and the other ceremonies, any more than the Gentiles. But that was not the thing in diſpute. Now, according to our interpretation, the apoſtle argues in the ſtrongeſt manner: "You ought not to put the yoke of ceremonies on the necks of the diſciples, who are converted from among the Gentiles, becauſe the fathers themſelves, who were under that yoke, really felt the uneaſineſs of it, but did not find ſalvation in it; and yet they were ſaved, not in conſequence of theſe ceremonies, but by the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Neither are we, nor any of the

human race, to take any other way to attain salvation. They therefore are under a mistake, who tell the disciples, If you will be saved, you must be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses." To sum up the whole then in a few words, the apostle here declares three things. 1. That the fathers *were saved*. 2. *By the very same covenant* that we are. 3. *Through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ;* intimating likewise by all this reasoning, that there can possibly be no more but *one* way of salvation.

XXXVI. This is likewise confirmed by that famous passage, *Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.** In the foregoing verse the apostle admonished them, to keep fresh in their memory *the word, which their guides had spoken unto them, whose faith they should follow.* Now, he gives this for the reason of that admonition, because *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever;* constantly preached by all the teachers of the truth, believed on by all, and to be believed on by those that come after, if they will imitate the faith of their predecessors. The same doctrine therefore is always to be retained, because Christ, who was always both proposed and believed as the Author of salvation, changeth not. Now, the particles, *yesterday, to-day, and for ever*, denote all the differences of times. Nor does *yesterday* here signify something of a late date, as we usually say, *yesterday* or *lately;* but *all the time past:* as the phrase *to-day* denotes *the time of grace under the New Testament.* For this is compared to some one present day; as chap. iii. 13. *While it is called, To-day;* and chap. iv. 7. *Again, he limiteth a certain day, saying in David, To-day;* of which 2 Cor. vi. 2, *Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salva-*

* Heb. xiii. 8.

tion. As therefore Chriſt is to-day, under the New Teſtament, acknowledged the alone Author of ſalvation, and will be acknowledged as ſuch for ever; ſo in like manner, *yeſterday*, under the Old Teſtament, which day is now paſt, he was the ſame, and as ſuch was declared and acknowledged.

XXXVII. Let us alſo add what we have in Heb. ix. 15. *And for this cauſe he is the mediator of the new teſtament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt teſtament, they which are called might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.* Where we have an open declaration, that the death of Jeſus Chriſt was effectual for the redemption of tranſgreſſions committed under the Old Teſtament. For thus the apoſtle proceeds. He ſuppoſes, that the fathers of the Old Teſtament were ſaved, notwithſtanding their ſins; which Socinus with his followers dare not deny. He ſays further, that the blood of bullocks, and of goats, and conſequently of all ſacrifices whatever, could not really, and before the tribunal of God, expiate ſin, and purify the conſcience. Yet ſince, as he declares, without ſhedding of blood there can be no remiſſion, ver. 22. he concludes, it was neceſſary, that the death of Chriſt ſhould intervene, to be undergone indeed, in order not only to the eſtabliſhment of the New Teſtament, but by virtue of which the redemption of former ſins might alſo be obtained. This is the genuine meaning of the ſacred writer.

XXXVIII. And truly Grotius ſhamefully ſhuffles, when, to favor the Socinians, he thus writes on this place: "His death intervened for this end, that men might be delivered from thoſe ſins, which generally prevailed, before Chriſt, among thoſe called God's people." Is it really ſo? Would thus *the redemption of the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt teſtament*, de-

note such an action of Christ, whereby succeeding ages would abstain from the like sins, as were formerly committed? God forbid, we should ever pervert scripture thus. Redemption is COPHÆR an expiation of sin, upon paying a ransom. Christ paid this for all the sins of his elect, at whatever time they lived. And in virtue of that payment, to be made at the appointed time, believers, even under the Old Testament, obtained redemption.

XXXIX. Moreover, since it is evident, that the pious ancients were saved, it must likewise be evident, that they were saved through Christ. For our Saviour himself says, *No man cometh unto the Father but by me.** And Peter, *Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.*† Nothing can be plainer than these words, which seem to be written as with a sunbeam. Yet the itch of contradiction has found something to say; but that something is less than nothing.

XL. Our adversaries except, that these passages should be underdood of those who live under the New Testament, and therefore that both Christ and Peter speak in the present, and not in the past time, of us, and not of the ancients; of the times when Christ was exhibited, and not of the ancient ages. We answer: 1. As both texts are expressed in universal terms, they are not to be limited without cause and necessity, as there is none in this case. For if salvation could be obtained formerly without Christ, equally as now through Christ, what need had we of Christ's coming? or what so very great matter do we obtain in Christ? 2. Nay, there are very solid reasons, why they neither ought nor can be thus restricted. Because they who were *without Christ*,

* John xiv. 6. † Acts iv. 12.

*were ſtrangers from the covenants of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world.** 3. The quibbling about the verbs being of the preſent time, is idle; becauſe verbs of that time may equally refer to all times. And whatever phraſe had been uſed, whether denoting the future or paſt time, there might always be room left for ſuch cavils. Beſides, no reaſon can be aſſigned, why the paſt time ſhould be excluded any more than the future, if that verb of the preſent tenſe is thus to be racked. What is falſe reaſoning againſt the Supreme Being, and a childiſh abuſe of one's genius and parts, if this be not ſo?

XLI. That which, in the third and laſt place, we promiſed to prove, namely, that there is no other means of communion with Chriſt but FAITH, appears from that very noted paſſage of Habakkuk, ſo often quoted by the apoſtle, *But the juſt ſhall live by his faith*, or the faith of him, namely, of the promiſed Meſſiah.† From which Paul, at different times, proves our juſtification, who live under the New Teſtament, through faith. And then Moſes declares concerning Abraham, *And he believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteouſneſs*;‡ which the apoſtle quotes for the ſame purpoſe.§ David likewiſe declares the man *bleſſed that putteth his truſt in him* [the Son.‖] And Iſaiah counſels the ſinner to *take hold of the ſtrength of the Lord*, and thus *make peace with him*.¶ But what is it to take hold of the fortreſs of the Lord, but to believe in the Lord? And finally, Paul, by a long enumeration of examples, which he took from the Old-teſtament fathers, attempts to prove this general truth, that *without faith it is impoſſible to pleaſe God*.**

* Eph. ii. 12. † Hab. ii. 4. ‡ Gen. xv. 6. § Rom. iv. 3. ‖ Pſal. ii. 12. ¶ Iſ. xxvii. 5. ** Heb. xi. 6.

XLII. Our adverſaries object, that the paſſages above mentioned, treat only of a general faith in God, and not of a ſpecial faith in Chriſt. We deny not, that as Chriſt was then more obſcurely revealed, ſo believers had likewiſe a leſs diſtinct knowledge of him; yet we boldly affirm, that they had ſome knowledge, and ſufficient for their time, upon the authority of our Lord, who ſays, *Abraham ſaw my day, and rejoiced;** and of Paul, who teſtifies concerning Moſes, *that he eſteemed the reproach of Chriſt greater riches than the treaſures in Egypt;*† and concerning the other fathers, that *they ſaw the promiſes afar off, and embraced them;*‡ and laſtly of Peter, who tells us, that the prophets *ſearched what or what manner of time, the Spirit of Chriſt which was in them, did ſignify, when it teſtified beforehand the ſufferings of Chriſt, and the glory that ſhould follow.*§ Since then theſe things were ſaid of the heroes of that time, it will not be hard to determine, what we are to judge concerning other believers, according to their rank and ſtation. And the patriarchs and prophets had not acted the part of honeſt men, if they had enviouſly concealed from other believers, ſuch a valuable talent, which was committed to their truſt.

XLIII. The apoſtle writes nothing in oppoſition to this truth, when he ſays,‖ *But before faith came, we were kept under the law.* For it is far from the apoſtle's intention to deny, that faith in Chriſt prevailed before his coming in the fleſh; becauſe, in the ſame chapter, he had highly commended the faith of Abraham, and propoſed it as a pattern to us all.¶ But by *faith* we here underſtand either the object of *faith*, the doctrine or the

* John viii. 56. † Heb. xi. 26. ‡ Ver. 13. § 1 Pet. i. 11.
‖ Gal. iii. 23. ¶ Gal. iii. 6, 7, 9.

goſpel, as chap. i. 23. and the Lord Jeſus himſelf, believed on in the world,* or *the faith of the redemption* already actually *wrought out*, as contradiſtinguiſhed from *the hope* of the Old-Teſtament ſaints, who, with earneſt longing, as it were, expected the coming of the Lord, *waiting for the conſolation of Iſrael*, Luke ii. 25. And thus we have now ſhewn, that the Old-Teſtament ſaints had the ſame promiſes of eternal life with us, to be obtained by the ſame Chriſt, and the ſame faith in him, and conſequently alſo had the ſame covenant of grace with us.

* 1 Tim. iii. 16.

CHAP. III.

Of the different Oeconomies or Diſpenſations of the Covenant of Grace.

IT nevertheleſs pleaſed God, at ſundry periods of time, and in diverſe manners, to diſpenſe the ſame covenant of grace. We ſhall exhibit, in this chapter, a ſhort repreſentation of theſe diſpenſations, in ſuch a method as, *firſt*, ſimply to explain what, in this matter, ſeems to us moſt accurate and agreeable to the whole tenor of ſcripture; and *then* freely, but calmly, weigh the reflections of other learned men.

II. The diverſity of theſe œconomies is comprized under two principal heads, which the apoſtle calls by the names of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*. Where we are to note, that by *the Old Teſtament*, we are by no means to underſtand *the legal covenant*, concerning obtaining ſalvation by our own works; which is very different from the covenant of grace. But, according to us and

Paul, the Old Teſtament denotes the teſtament [or covenant] of grace under that diſpenſation, which ſubſiſted before the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh, and was propoſed formerly to the fathers under the vail of certain types, pointing out ſome imperfection of that ſtate, and conſequently that they were to be aboliſhed in their appointed time: or, as Calvin has very well expreſſed it,* *The Old Teſtament was a diſpenſation involved in a ſhadow and ineffectual obſervation of ceremonies, and was therefore temporary, becauſe a thing in ſuſpenſe, till eſtabliſhed on a firm and ſubſtantial bottom. The New Teſtament* is the teſtament [or covenant] of grace, under that diſpenſation which ſucceeded the former, after being conſecrated and eſtabliſhed by the blood of Chriſt. For this reaſon Chriſt calls the cup, which he reached to his diſciples in the ſupper, *the cup of the new teſtament in his blood*,† to ſignify, that then at length the New Teſtament would be perfected, when ſealed by the blood of the teſtator ſhed at his death.

III. It is carefully to be obſerved, that the difference of theſe teſtaments is not to be placed in the ſubſtance of the promiſed inheritance, as if, under the Old Teſtament, was allotted the inheritance of the land of Canaan, and the inheritance of heaven under the New. Nothing can be imagined leſs accurate and juſt. The allotment of the heavenly inheritance proceeds from the teſtament of grace abſolutely conſidered, which remains invariably one and the ſame under every œconomy. Only the ſame inheritance is propoſed in a different manner; in the Old Teſtament under ſhadows, and in a certain period thereof, under the pledge of the land of Canaan, and which at the appointed time was to be purchaſed by the death of the teſtator: in the New Teſta-

* Inſtitut. lib. 2. c. 11. § 4. † Matth. xxvi. 28.

ment clearly, without a pledge, to which any regard was to be had, and as now purchaſed by the death of the teſtator. The promiſe of the common ſalvation, which is in Chriſt, whether formerly made to the fathers, or to us at this day, does not belong to the Old or New Teſtament as ſuch, but abſolutely to the teſtament or covenant of grace. The difference of the teſtaments conſiſts in the different manner of diſpenſing and propoſing the ſame ſaving grace, and in ſome different adjuncts and circumſtances. Whatever was typical in that diſpenſation, and denoted imperfection, and an acknowledgement that the ranſom was not yet paid, belongs to the Old Teſtament. Whatever ſhews, that the redemption is actually wrought out, is peculiar to the New Teſtament. Without carefully adverting to this, it is not poſſible, we can have an accurate knowledge of the nature of both teſtaments.

IV. But let us inſiſt a little further on this point, if poſſibly we may advance, what may ſet the truth in a clear light. Three things are to be diſtinguiſhed: the teſtament of grace, the Old and New Teſtament. To each its own inheritance is to be aſſigned. That of the teſtament of grace is eternal ſalvation, with every thing belonging to it, through Jeſus Chriſt; which is equally common to believers in all ages. The Old and New Teſtament being different œconomies of this one teſtament of grace, which they comprize, ſuppoſe alſo and include the ſame heavenly inheritance. But in ſo far as they are different, the inheritance alſo attributed to each is different. Now, that difference conſiſts chiefly in two things: firſt, in the different manner of propoſing it, which, I hope, I have now clearly explained: then, in the circumſtantial adjuncts of the principal inheritance. Theſe in the Old Teſtament are, the inheritance of the land of Canaan, as a pledge of heaven, with a

bondage to the elements of the world, and the exclusion of the Gentiles, and a less measure of the Spirit of grace. In the New Testament, the inheritance of the Gentiles, with liberty, and a more plentiful measure of grace.

V. We begin the œconomy of the Old Testament immediately upon the fall, and the first promise of grace, and end it in Christ; as both the nature of the thing and scripture direct us to do. We argue from the nature of the thing, in this manner: Since believers had the covenant of grace proposed and confirmed to them, immediately after the fall, by such signs, as contained a confession, that guilt was not yet expiated; and which therefore were, at the time appointed, to be abrogated by the introduction of the New Testament: there can be no reason, why the promise thus proposed and ratified, should not be the Old Testament. We don't refer to the Old Testament the promise of the seed of the woman bruising the serpent's head, and of the enmity established between the seed of both; for these things absolutely belong to the covenant of grace. But the sacrifices which are added, by the blood of which that testament was confirmed, belong indeed to the Old Testament. It appears more than probable to us, with some very learned men, from the Mosaic history, that immediately upon the promulgation of the covenant of grace, Adam, at the command of God, slew beasts for sacrifice, whose skins were, by the favor of God, granted to him and his wife for cloathing: which was not without its mystical signification, as shall be explained in its proper place. It is certain we have an express account of sacrifices,* which account, in the opinion of chronologers, happened about the year of Adam 129. See-

* Gen. iv. 2. & seq.

ing therefore theſe ſacrifices belong to the teſtament of grace, and typically ſeal the blood of Chriſt, which was to be ſhed in due time, and likewiſe remind of guilt not yet expiated, they can be referred to nothing but the Old Teſtament. For whatever is thus joined to the covenant of grace, and cannot poſſibly be referred to the New Teſtament, the very force of the words requires its being ſaid of the Old Teſtament. To this argument a certain very learned perſon objects as follows: "Adam, the deluge, and the rainbow, were types, and previous to the actual performance of redemption, and yet they belong not expreſsly to the Old Teſtament. For this laſt was abrogated with all its ſhadows. But theſe others ceaſe not to be types of greater and ſpiritual things to us." But the anſwer ſeems to be eaſy. The deliverance of the Iſraelites out of Egypt, the paſſage through the Red ſea, their wonderful ſupport in the wilderneſs by Manna, and water from the rock, the fall of Jericho, the expulſion of the nations out of Canaan, the carrying away of the Iſraelites into Babylon, their return from Babylon, and many other things of the like nature (for it would be endleſs to recount all) do they not all belong to the Old-teſtament œconomy? But theſe very things certainly ceaſe not, according to the ſentiments of very learned men, to be all of them types of the greateſt things to the Chriſtian church. The city of Jeruſalem itſelf, the very temple, with its whole pomp of ceremonies, though no longer in being, any more than Adam and the deluge, yet ought alſo to be conſidered by us Chriſtians as types of the heavenly city, and temple not made with hands. In a word, the whole of the Moſaic law, though abrogated as to any obligation of obſervance, ceaſes not to exhibit to us, for our inſtruction, a type of ſpiritual things.

VI. There is another reaſon taken from Paul; who reduces all theſe inſtitutions of God to the Old Teſtament;* *Which decay and wax old, and are ready to vaniſh away.* Now, it is certain, that not only thoſe things which were firſt ordained by Moſes, but thoſe alſo which were in force long before Moſes, as ſacrifices and circumciſion, were abrogated by the introduction of the New Teſtament. But theſe were not abrogated, becauſe, as the learned perſon would have it, they were reduced by Moſes, with the reſt of his conſtitutions, into one ſhadowy ſyſtem, but becauſe they were of the ſame nature with the Moſaical; namely, ſhadows, which were to give place to Chriſt the ſubſtance. And they were ſo, not from their being renewed by Moſes, but from their firſt inſtitution.

VII. Nor do we ſpeak without ſcripture, when we reckon all that time which followed from the fall to the coming of Chriſt, to the Old or former Teſtament. For thus we have the apoſtle's authority:† *And for this cauſe he is the mediator of the new teſtament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt teſtament, they which are called, might receive the promiſe of eternal inheritance.* Now, it is evident, that, by the death of Chriſt, the tranſgreſſions not only of thoſe believers who lived under the Moſaic œconomy, but alſo of the more ancient patriarchs, were expiated from the foundation of the world; to which the apoſtle's reaſoning leads us, as by the hand.‡ Therefore to their time alſo *the firſt teſtament* belongs. Nor can any reaſon be given, why the apoſtle ſhould make particular mention of any determinate period, ſeeing the efficacy of Chriſt's death equally extends to all believers backward. Which was alſo finely obſerved

* Heb. viii. 13. † Heb. ix. 15. ‡ Ver. 26.

by Coccius himſelf in his comment on this place: "Thoſe very ſins therefore, which *have been*, and were not remitted under the firſt teſtament, ſeeing that ſin which all men have in common, becauſe all are ſaid to have ſinned, when Adam ſinned, Rom. v. 12. and all other ſins his children were guilty of, as alſo the ſins of thoſe who expected Chriſt, in order that the teſtament, which gives remiſſion and the inheritance, might be ratified, ought to be expiated by the death of the Mediator, as by a ranſom."

VIII. We will again conſider and examine the very learned perſon's exception: and thus he ſpeaks; "From the time that ſin was imputed, to wit, from the time of the law, there being made, by the law of Moſes and the Moſaic inſtitutions, a commemoration and exprobation [or charge or accuſation] of ſin, and a hand-writing exacted, Heb. x. 3. Col. ii. 14. hence all the preceding ſins, committed during all the time of the forbearance, are ſaid to *have been* in a peculiar manner under the Old Teſtament. Not that the Old Teſtament was from the time in which ſin was firſt committed, but that thoſe committed before the Old Teſtament, are ſaid, in a peculiar manner, *to have* then chiefly *exiſted when they were* imputed, commemorated, and exprobated [or charged.] Nor did it contribute a little to heighten the virtue of Chriſt's death, expreſsly to have obſerved, that ſins not only imputed, when there was no law; but alſo very often imputed and charged, were yet, by the death of Chriſt, entirely removed, ſo that there is no more remembrance of them."

IX. Theſe things are ſo ſubtile (for I hardly dare call them obſcure and perplexed, leſt the learned perſon ſhould be offended) that I own I do not underſtand them all; I will however attempt it. He ſuppoſes with me, and with all the orthodox, that the virtue of Chriſt's

redemption extends to the removing all the ſins of all the elect, from the beginning of the world. This being ſo, he inquires, why Paul called thoſe ſins *the tranſgreſſions that were under the firſt teſtament.* The reaſon of which he will not have what we contend for; namely, that the Old Teſtament was from the time in which ſin was to be expiated by Chriſt, but that all the preceding ſins, committed from the beginning of the world, are ſaid, in a peculiar manner, *to have been* and *to have exiſted under the Old Teſtament*, or Moſaic œconomy. But why did thoſe very old ſins exiſt under the Old Teſtament? Becauſe then they were imputed and charged, by that remembrance of ſin that was made by the law of Moſes. From this reaſoning I firſt aſſert, that, by the tranſgreſſions under the firſt teſtament, are underſtood all the preceding ſins, which were committed during the whole time of *the forbearance.* Whence by a very eaſy conſequence it follows, that the times of *the forbearance*, in the ſenſe the learned perſon uſes that expreſſion, that is, the ages which went before the coming of the Meſſiah, and of *the firſt teſtament*, are of equal extenſion. No, ſays he: But the very old ſins, ſuppoſe of Adam, Enoch, Noah, are ſaid to *have exiſted* under the Moſaic covenant or teſtament. Where, learned Sir? Where, I ſay, is it ſaid, that the ſins committed before the Old Teſtament, *exiſted* in a peculiar manner, upon the introduction of the law of Moſes? Not certainly in theſe words of Paul. For the very word *exiſting* is not to be found there, much leſs in the ſenſe you frame to yourſelf. I imagine the learned perſon had in his eye, Rom. v. 13. *For until the law, ſin was in the world.* But in what manner ſoever this may be explained, the apoſtle never and no where, that I know of, ſays, that the ſins, for inſtance, committed by the inhabitants of the firſt world,

exiſted in a peculiar manner under the œconomy of the Moſaic teſtament. And in what ſenſe, pray, ſhould they be ſaid to have then exiſted? Becauſe, ſays he, they were then imputed and charged. But to whom? Not certainly to thoſe very perſons, who, dying in the faith, were received into heaven. And how imputed and exprobated by the introduction of the Moſaic teſtament? Seeing it was ſo much later than their death and ſalvation, it does not greatly regard thoſe departed pious and happy perſons, at leaſt as to its rigour. I don't refuſe, that the Iſraelites were convinced of their ſins by the Moſaic law, and that a remembrance of ſin was made, and that all mankind was condemned in the Iſraelites: but that the ſins of the moſt ancient believers were then imputed and charged, and then in a peculiar manner exiſted, is neither aſſerted in ſcripture, nor conſonant to reaſon.

X. But this alſo deſerves conſideration, that he would have the apoſtle expreſsly mention the Moſaic teſtament, becauſe that tended to amplify the virtue of Chriſt's death, as peculiarly ſhining forth therein; ſeeing it has removed all remembrance of thoſe very ſins, which were often imputed and charged upon them by the law. Which does not indeed appear to me to be very pertinent to that matter. For ſince the commemoration and remembrance of ſins are made in the repeated offering of the ſame ſacrifices, which could not take away ſins, and ſacrifices of that kind began to be uſed immediately upon the promulgation of the teſtament of grace; theſe very ſins were alſo commemorated and charged by ſacrifices, which were anterior to the Moſaic œconomy. But if, on the introducing the law of Moſes, that charging of ſin was more frequent and ſtrong; the promiſe, in the ſame law, was likewiſe more frequent and ſtrong, as likewiſe the ſign and ſeal of the remiſſion of ſins, which

the Meſſiah was to procure. For the ſame inſtitutions which commemorated ſin, ſignified alſo and ſealed the future expiation of it by the Meſſiah. If therefore, on the one hand, it may ſeem ſtrange, that thoſe very ſins were alſo expiated by Chriſt, which were ſo often commemorated and charged; on the other hand, the expiation of thoſe ſins which was ſo often ſignified and ſealed, appears leſs ſtrange. But the pious meditation of the redemption purchaſed by Chriſt, ſtands in no need of any ſuch ſubtleties of idle diſputation. It is ſufficient to ſay with Paul, that the efficacy of the death of Chriſt, who is the Mediator of the New Teſtament, is ſuch that it has purchaſed for the elect in every age, the redemption of thoſe tranſgreſſions, which could never be expiated by any blood of bulls or goats. Our argument therefore remains in its full force, and is in vain attacked by the windings and mazes of a perplexed diſcourſe. *The tranſgreſſions under the firſt teſtament*, are ſins committed from the moſt ancient period of the world; therefore *the firſt teſtament* compriſes all the ages from the firſt origin of the world.

XI. Moreover, in this œconomy of the Old Teſtament, ſeveral periods are diſtinctly to be obſerved. For *God, at ſundry times and in divers manners, ſpake unto the fathers.** *The firſt* period reaches from Adam to Noah, and comprehends the whole age of the firſt world. In which every thing was very ſimple and plain. The firſt goſpel-promiſe was publiſhed by God, received by faith by our firſt parents, was inculcated on their children by inceſſant catechiſing, or inſtruction, ſealed by ſacrifices offered in faith. The death of the Meſſiah, the righteous One, the moſt beloved of God, who was to be ſlain by his envious brethren, was prefigured in

* Heb. i. 1.

the perſon of Abel, who was murdered by Cain; his aſcenſion into heaven, with all his faithful people, was foreſhewn in the type of Enoch, who alſo, according to Jude, ver. 14. propheſied of his return to judgment with ten thouſands of his ſaints; and in fine, the ſeparation of the ſons of God from the ſons of men for the pure worſhip of God.

XII. *The ſecond* period begins with *Noah*; in whom his father Lamech ſeems to have beheld a certain type of the Meſſiah, when he ſaid, *This ſame ſhall comfort us concerning our work and toil of our hands*, and therefore he called his name *Noah*, which ſignifies *reſt*.* He was a juſt and upright man in his generation, and *a preacher of righteouſneſs*.† By him Chriſt *preached to the ſpirits in priſon*.‡ He was not only *heir of the righteouſneſs of faith*,§ but the head and reſtorer of a new world, and in that reſpect an eminent type of Chriſt. For the ſame purpoſe the ark was built by him; the ſacrifice of a ſweet-ſmelling ſavour offered to God; God's gracious covenant entered into with the habitable world after that ſacrifice, and ſealed by the rainbow; and many other things of the like kind, full of myſtical ſenſe, which ſhall be explained in due time. This ſecond period reaches down to Abraham.

XIII. To this ſucceeds *the third* period from *Abraham* to Moſes. There was indeed very great and precious promiſes made to Abraham; as of the multiplying his ſeed, of giving that ſeed the land of Canaan, of the Meſſiah to ſpring from his loins, of the inheritance of the world, and the like. The covenant of grace was ſolemnly confirmed with him, and ſealed by the new ſacrament of circumciſion; and himſelf conſtituted the father of all the faithful, both of his own ſeed according

* Gen. v. 29. † 2 Pet. ii. 5. ‡ 1 Pet. iii. 19. § Heb. xi. 7.

to the flesh, and of the Gentiles.* Melchizedek a priest and king, a king of righteousness and peace, meets him fatigued after the overthrow and pursuit of his enemies, who also blessed him, and presented to him in himself, as in an eminent type, a view of the Messiah. Hence was kindled in Abraham a desire of seeing still more clearly the day of Christ, which he both saw, and rejoiced at.† This favor of the Supreme Being was continued to Abraham's son and grandson, Isaac and Jacob, to whom he often made himself known by repeated revelations, which confirmed to them the promises made to that great patriarch, and proposed them to future generations as the chiefs of his covenant. And thus the old promises of the covenant of grace were enlarged with many additions, and enriched with a fuller declaration.

XIV. But things put on a quite different aspect under the *fourth* period, which was introduced by the ministry of *Moses*. The people were delivered out of Egypt by an outstretched arm and by tremendous prodigies. The Son of God, before all the congregation of the people, declared himself to be the King of Israel, by the solemn manner in which he gave the law from mount Sinai, amidst thunderings and lightnings. The tabernacle, and the ark of the covenant with the propitiatory [or mercy seat] the gracious residence of God, were constructed with wonderful art. An incredible number of ceremonies was added to the ancient simplicity. So many myriads of men (strange to relate) were fed with manna from heaven, in the horrid and scorched deserts of Arabia, for forty years, and supplied with water from a rock, which Moses struck with his rod. Whole nations were cast out before them, and devoted

* Rom. iv. 12. † John viii. 56.

to deſtruction. Iſrael, as the favored inheritance of God, was introduced, after a very great deſtruction of their enemies, to the promiſed poſſeſſion of Canaan; and who can pretend to enumerate all the things with which this period was ennobled above the others; *of which we cannot now ſpeak particularly?**

XV. Seeing all the inſtitutions of former ages were renewed under the direction of Moſes, and enlarged with very many additions, and reduced to a certain form of worſhip, and, as it were into one body or ſyſtem; and the covenant was ſolemnly renewed with Iſrael both at mount Sinai, and in the plains of Moab; therefore it is, that, in the ſacred writings, the Old-teſtament covenant is aſcribed to Moſes, and to his miniſtry and times.† Not that either at that time all theſe things, on which the Old Teſtament depended, were firſt inſtituted, or that, on no account, it is to be referred to the preceding times; for the religion of both times, namely, both before and after Moſes, was the ſame; and many rites the very ſame, as ſacrifices, the diſtinction of clean and unclean beaſts, circumciſion, and many others: but that then the confirmation both of old and new rites was reduced into a certain form of a ritual, and that period was ſo diſtinguiſhed by a ſolemn renovation of the covenant, and by many additions, that it ſeemed to ſwallow up, as it were, all that went before. We likewiſe at other times read, that ſomething is ſaid to be given by Moſes, which was long before Moſes's time. Our Lord ſays, *Moſes therefore gave unto you circumciſion, not becauſe it is of Moſes, but of the fathers.*‡ God alſo is ſaid *to have given Iſrael in the wilderneſs his ſtatutes, which if a man do he ſhall even live in them.*§ Yet who could

* Heb. ix. 5. † Heb. viii. 9. from Jer. xxxi. 32. ‡ John vii. 22.
§ Ezek. xx. 11.

from thence conclude, that the origin of thoſe ſtatutes was only to be derived from that time? ſeeing it is plain, that they were contemporary with man, and from the beginning made known to all believers by the teaching of the Spirit of God. This Moſaic period laſted (though, under the kings David and Solomon, there was a great acceſſion of magnificence made to the public worſhip, by the ſuperb ſtructure of the temple, and the appointment of its miniſtry) even to the Lord Jeſus, or his forerunner John. For thus we are taught, *The law was given by Moſes, but grace and truth came by Jeſus Chriſt.** *The law and the prophets were until John; ſince that time the kingdom of God is preached.*†

XVI. When the Old teſtament evaniſhed, the NEW ſucceeded; whoſe beginning and epocha divines do not fix in one and the ſame point of time. Some begin the New Teſtament *from the birth* of Chriſt, becauſe of that expreſſion of the apoſtle, Gal. iv. 4. in which he aſſerts the fulneſs of time was come, when God ſent his Son made of a woman: to which they add, that, on that very day, the angels proclaimed the goſpel concerning Chriſt manifeſted.‡ Others begin the New Teſtament *from the year of Chriſt's preaching*, alledging Mark i. 1. Where the evangeliſt ſeems to refer the beginning of the goſpel to that year, in which John and Chriſt began to preach; which is more clearly taught in that paſſage, juſt cited from Luke xvi. 16. Others again place the beginning of the New Teſtament *at the moment of Chriſt's death*, upon the authority of the apoſtle, who ſays, that the New Teſtament was ratified by the death of Chriſt the Teſtator.§ Some, in ſhort, on the day of Pentecoſt, or the effuſion of the Holy Spirit on the

* John i. 17. † Luke xvi. 16. ‡ Luke ii. 10, 11.
§ Heb. ix. 17.

apoſtles, on which the New Teſtament was, as it were, ſealed, and its law came out of Zion.*

XVII. But all theſe things are eaſily reconciled, if we allow ſome latitude to that fulneſs of time, in which the New ſucceeded the Old Teſtament. God, indeed, began to prepare for the New Teſtament from the very birth of Chriſt, on which very day the goſpel of Chriſt exhibited began to be preached to the ſhepherds; but thoſe beginnings were very ſmall; but ſoon after ſhone forth more illuſtriouſly by the preaching of John, proclaiming the kingdom of heaven to be at hand,† and of Chriſt himſelf, aſſerting it was already come, and even among the people of the Jews.‡ Yet the kingdom of heaven did not directly and all at once attain to its full ſtate of maturity, but by ſlow degrees acquired ſtrength, till Chriſt, having finiſhed the work which the Father gave him to do, compleated all by his death, and ratified the New Teſtament. By this death of Chriſt, the Old Teſtament was of right abrogated. Yet there was an acceſſion of greater ſolemnity to the New, when, after the death, reſurrection, and aſcenſion of our Lord, upon the plentiful effuſion of the Spirit on the apoſtles, the doctrine of ſalvation was proclaimed over all the habitable world, God, at the ſame time, bearing witneſs by ſigns and wonders, and various virtues and gifts of the Holy Ghoſt. Yet ſo that the church did not enjoy the full liberty of the New Teſtament, till after God had rejected the people of Iſrael, who ſtiffly adhered to their ceremonies, till the temple was burnt, and their whole land was ſmitten with a curſe; which time of full liberty the apoſtle, in his day,§ called *the world to come.*

XVIII. Hence we ſee, that the cloſe of the Old Teſtament, gradually vaniſhing away, and the begin-

* Iſ. ii. 3. † Matth. iii. 2. ‡ Luke xvii. 21. § Heb. ii. 5.

ning of the New gradually gaining ground, both centered in one point of time. For as, on the birth of Chriſt, a more joyful period ſhone forth, and the ſongs of the pious were heard, concerning the truth of God's covenant confirmed by the accompliſhment of the promiſes; ſo Chriſt acknowledged himſelf to be ſubject to the laws of the Old Teſtament by his circumciſion, and the rites following upon it. And as the kingdom of heaven, which is a kingdom of liberty, was preached by our Lord,* ſo he ordered, in the mean time, the perſon cleanſed of his leproſy to offer the ſacrifice enjoined by the law of Moſes.† Which is an evident indication of the Old Teſtament ſtill maintaining its ground. Of right it was entirely abrogated, when, upon Chriſt's death, the vail of the temple was rent, and the holy of holies before hid and concealed, was then ſet open to all; and by the blood of a dying Chriſt the New Teſtament was ſealed. However, for ſome time the apoſtles themſelves apprehended, that there was a ſanctity in the ceremonies, till Peter was better taught by a heavenly viſion.‡ In ſhort, the church ſtruggled with the obſervation of theſe ceremonies, now in the pangs of death, till Jeruſalem was taken and deſtroyed by the Romans, and the temple ſet on fire; together with theſe, all remains of the Old Teſtament, which were long before condemned to death, quite expired, and made way for a New Teſtament, then at laſt blazing forth in the full luſtre of its liberty.

XIX. And here again we are to obſerve various periods, which are diſtinctly deſcribed in the prophetic writings, eſpecially in the myſtical revelation of John, ſome of which the church has already experienced, and

* John iv. 21, 23. † Matth. viii. 4. ‡ Acts x. 10, 11, &c.

expects the reſt with faith and patience. Periods, I ſay, not relating to any new worſhip, either inſtituted or to be inſtituted by God, after the preaching of the everlaſting goſpel; but reſpecting very different viciſſitudes in the church, and times either more adverſe or more proſperous, in which truth and piety were either oppreſſed, and, being wounded and ſpent by many perſecutions, were forced to conceal themſelves in deſerts, or then victoriouſly triumphed over their enemies, and being placed on an illuſtrious throne, dazzled the eyes of all with the refulgent beams of their light. Of all theſe we will alſo ſpeak in their place.

XX. In this manner we imagine, we have reckoned up properly enough, and agreeably to the ſacred writings, the œconomies of the times. Yet ſome very learned men have thought otherwiſe, who are better pleaſed with the *trichotomy*, or threefold diviſion, than with the received *dichotomy*, or twofold diſtribution. They therefore conſider the adminiſtration of the covenant of grace, 1. *Under the promiſe*, before the law, which they contend to have been a promiſe of mere grace and liberty, without any yoke or burden of an accuſing law. 2. *Under the law*, where they will have the Old Teſtament begin. 3. *Under the goſpel*, where the New begins. This diverſity would not be of that importance, as to oblige us therefore to throw up the cauſe we plead for, if it conſiſted only in the computation of times. But ſeeing a vaſt difference is made between theſe œconomies, it will not be from the purpoſe more minutely to examine theſe thoughts.

XXI. It appears certain, that the fathers living before the Moſaic law, were loaded with a much lighter burthen of ceremonies, than the Iſraelites were under and after Moſes: yet it does not appear, that they enjoyed full liberty, without any yoke and burthen of an

accuſing law. For, to ſay nothing of the law of nature, which, with its appendages of curſes, was handed down by conſtant inſtruction, they had precepts concerning ſacrifices, not indeed binding them to a certain time and place, but yet enjoining ſacrifices (which indeed were not will-worſhip) and diſtinguiſhing clean from unclean beaſts. This I imagine the very learned perſons will not deny. At leaſt the celebrated Cocceius finds fault with Grotius, who affirms, that the offering of Abel was made "without any command of God, from the dictates of reaſon only;" and he inſiſts, that Abel could not have offered in faith "without the word of God;" and that he did not offer "according to his own pleaſure and fancy, but by the direction of the Holy Spirit, Adam doubtleſs being the interpreter, and ſetting an example here." The ſame thing he proves at large, in *Sum. de fœd.* § 305. on Gen. iv. § 14, 19, 20. And another of thoſe, whoſe opinion we are now examining, writes to this purpoſe:* "The ſacrifices of believers were doubtleſs of divine inſtitution:" which after he had proved by various arguments, he thus concludes: "In fine, if God made a diſtinction between clean and unclean animals before the deluge, which was done on account of ſacrifices, doubtleſs God alſo appointed ſacrifices." But in every ſacrifice there was a *remembrance* of ſins not yet expiated; and, as Athanaſius ſpeaks, ONEIDISMOS, *a reproaching* of, and a hand-writing, which was very much againſt the ſacrificers. For the reproaching with ſin conſiſts not only in this, that the offering of ſacrifices was limited to a certain time and place, as was done under Moſes; but in the very offering of the ſacrifices: for when a man ſlew and burnt the animals which God granted him for food, he thereby

* Momma on the threefold œconomy, book i. chap. 3. § 10.

signified, that he himself deserved destruction; nay, and to perish in avenging flames for ever; and that he who, by the one offering of himself, was truly to expiate the sins of all the elect, was not yet come: and that when he offered frolicksome animals, who are apt to go astray from the flock, useless kept by the shepherd, thereby were signified the guilt of sin and our going astray, as very learned men have observed from Is. liii. 6.

XXII. It is therefore strange, that a great man, in answer to this question, Whether Abel's sacrifice was propitiatory or eucharistical? should say, "that before Moses's time sacrifices for sins, were not instituted by God, the design of which was to accuse of sin.* That this is said without proof, appears plain: 1. Because in that case no sacrifices were instituted before Moses, to be types of the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ. For as it was necessary there should be an agreement between the type and antitype, those sacrifices, which shadowed forth the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, were also in their measure propitiatory; that is, they so expiated sin to the cleansing of the flesh, as at the same time to condemn sin, and to shew, that they were not sufficient for its real expiation, because they were to be often repeated. Neither do the learned doubt, but that the sacrifices even of the oldest patriarchs were sacraments and types of Christ's sacrifice; for they write in express words, that "the fathers offered before Moses's time the same sacrifices with Moses, and apt to signify the same things."† 2. It also appears, that Job, who, it is probable, lived before, certainly without the Mosaic polity, offered NCOLOTH burnt-offerings for his children and friends, in order to expatiate the sins they had committed.‡ Now, the end of a burnt-offering is, "to be accepted

* Coccejus in Gen. vi. § 11. † Ibid. 20. ‡ Job i. 5. and xlii. 8

for him that offers, to make atonement for him, Lev. i. 4. And by such sacrifices the believers of that time testified," (which is the learned person's own observation*) "that they acknowledged, that such a satisfaction was due to God, which was not possible for themselves to make." This was a charge of guilt and inability; which the same great man could not conceal, when he treats of the burnt-offerings offered by Job, at the command of God, for his friends; and expresses himself thus:† "For though many sacrifices were slain, and the man indeed, upon offering a beast, was no longer deemed a sinner, but a righteous person among men; yet *conscience was accused of sin*, and consequently offerings were both to be accumulated and repeated without end." See the same author on Job ix. 28. but especially on Job vii. 1. "Job complains not," says he, "of that servitude, whereby we obey God; but of that laid on the fathers, which is a heavy yoke of fear, and of the terror of the law, with the greatest incumbrance of ceremonies.—But tho' Job seems to have lived before the law of Moses, and not to have been loaded with so many ceremonies as the Israelites; yet his condition was no better than theirs." There were therefore, in the sacrifices which God enjoined from the beginning, a reproaching with, and an accusation of sin; and consequently a yoke, not consistent with that liberty of the fathers, which these learned men imagine.

XXIII. And what will they answer us with respect to circumcision? Was not that also a yoke? since it was "not to be performed without blood, and mixed with much pain and shame." Was there not in it an accusation of sin? "When the new-born infant could not enter into God's covenant, without first shedding his

* In Job i. 5. † In Job xlii. 8.

blood. Whence this ſacrament was performed on the genital member, to denote the original ſtain; and by the cutting off of a ſmall part of the fleſh, the whole man was declared to be worthy of death."* Let the learned perſons here acknowledge their own words. And what is more plain from the holy writings of the New Teſtament, than that circumciſion was conſidered by the apoſtles as the principal part of the heavy yoke?† Nevertheleſs, it does not appear, that Moſes made any addition of rigour to it; having been, long before, enjoined upon Abraham at firſt under pain of being cut off. From whence we conclude, that the condition of the ancient patriarchs is too much extolled above that of the Jewiſh church, when it is inſiſted, that they lived in liberty, without any charge of ſin, without any yoke; though we readily grant, that the ſervitude was heightened, and the yoke made heavier under the Moſaic polity. And this is what we had to ſay on the firſt period.

XXIV. They make *the law* to be the ſecond period, under which they would have the Old Teſtament to begin: which they define, to be "the will and purpoſe of God, whereby he determined to give ſome of Abraham's poſterity, as his own people, the inheritance of the land of Canaan as his own land." And they add, "that this teſtament commenced from the departure out of Egypt, and from mount Sinai." Which a very learned perſon endeavours to prove by ſeveral arguments briefly joined together in the following manner.‡ The ſcripture ſays,§ that God made the Old Teſtament with the fathers, when he brought them out of Egypt; that is, called them to the inheritance of the land, as of

* Burman. ſynopſ. lib. 3. c. 6. § 19, 22. † Acts xv. 5. compared with ver. 10. ‡ Cocceii Sum. theol. c. 53. § 3. Animadverſ. ad 83 quæſt. § 2. confer præfat. in epiſt. ad Epheſ. § Jer. xxxi. 32.

a pledge, &c. In like manner Paul* says, that the two teſtaments were ſignified by Hagar and Sarah, and that the firſt was truly from mount Sinai. The ſame Paul ſays,† *Neither the firſt teſtament was* [initiated] *dedicated without blood.* He has his eye on Exod. xxiv. 8. He ſays ENKEKANISTAI, it was initiated; therefore that teſtament then became KAINE, *new*. Conſequently, that teſtament was then introduced. Nay, it is ſaid, *The Lord our God made a covenant with us in Horeb: the Lord made not this covenant with our fathers.*‡ —How can we conceive, that the fathers had that which, we are told, had not been intimated to them?

XXV. Our reflections on this ſubject, which we ſubmit to the examination of the learned, are theſe. 1. They ſeem to confine the Old Teſtament within too narrow bounds, who define it only by the deſtination of the land of Canaan as a pledge of heaven; as we ſhewed § 2. Doubtleſs, according to the Old Teſtament, the inheritance of the land of Canaan was given to the Iſraelites: but this does not complete the whole ſubſtance of the Old Teſtament, which Paul clearly enough declares,§ without ſpeaking any thing of the land of Canaan, conſiſted in a typical proſpect of the heavenly inheritance, and compriſed every thing that imports a typical ſervitude, and was to be aboliſhed upon the introduction of the New Teſtament.

XXVI. 2. When learned men ſay, that the Old Teſtament commences from the departure out of Egypt, and from mount Sinai, and call it the will or purpoſe of giving the land of Canaan, they underſtand not by that will or that purpoſe, the counſel or decree of God, as it is from eternity; nor the execution of that decree,

* Gal. iv. 24. † Heb. ix. 18. ‡ Deut. v. 2, 3.
§ Gal. iv. and Heb. ix.

which was not effected at mount Sinai, but forty years after, when, under the conduct of Joshua, they were introduced into the land: but they understand the declaration of the counsel of God by an irrevocable promise. Now, that promise was not first made at mount Sinai, but long before, even to the patriarch Abraham, four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law; *Unto thy seed will I give this land.** And it was confirmed by solemn signs, and sealed by the blood of sacrifices.† Whence we conclude, that, if the Old Testament be the declaration of the will of God, about giving the land of Canaan, it did not commence from Moses, but from Abraham.

XXVII. 3. Hence it appears, what answer ought to be given to Jer. xxxi. 32. and Gal. iv. 24. namely, that the first institution of the Old Testament is not treated of in these places, but the solemn renewal and confirmation of it, and the accession of many new rites, which we mentioned § 18. For God himself testified oftener than once about that time, that he did all those things in virtue of his covenant entered into with Abraham. *God remembered his covenant with Abraham,*‡ &c. *And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear* [*with my uplifted hand*] *to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob: and I will give it you for an heritage.*§ It therefore remains, that the testament about giving the land of Canaan, was not then first published, but solemnly repeated, when God was now meditating the accomplishment of it. And this is what Jeremiah and Paul intend in the places quoted.

XXVIII. 4. What the apostle says, *Neither the first testament was* [initiated] *dedicated without blood,*‖ is very

* Gen. xii. 7. † Gen. xv. 7. ‡ Exod. ii. 24. § Chap. vi. 8.
‖ Heb. ix. 18.

general, and may be extended to the firſt ſacrifices, which were ſlain at God's command. The very learned Cloppenburg* from the ſame paſſage of Paul inſiſts, that there was no interval of time between the firſt promiſe of the future ſeed of the woman, and the firſt ſacrifice. "The apoſtle," ſays he, "confirms this our opinion, when he ſays, that the Old Teſtament was not dedicated without blood, and that without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion of ſins. For hence it follows, that, with that promiſe about the future ſeed of the woman, there was either no ſolemnizing of the ſpiritual covenant of God with man, by which he might hope for and believe the remiſſion of ſins, or that there was none without ſhedding of blood." The apoſtle, indeed, mentions what we have in Exod. xxiv. as an example. But it does not thence follow, that no other example of that truth could be given before that; or that any would miſtake the ſubject, who ſhould add to the apoſtle's argument, what we find Gen. xv. about the beaſts which were ſlain by Abraham.

XXIX. And the term *dedicated* ought not to be ſo inſiſted upon, as if that neceſſarily inferred, that the teſtament, thus dedicated, was entirely new. For even that may be ſaid to be dedicated, which is again ſolemnly dedicated, though the thing itſelf was in being long before. Thus the author of 1 Macc. chap. vi. writes about the temple profaned by Antiochus, KAI ENEKAINISTHE TO HAGIASMA OS TO PROTERON, *and the ſanctuary was dedicated as before.* Yet Antiochus had not deſtroyed the ſanctuary, ſo as to make it neceſſary to build one entirely new, but had only profaned it, which Judas Maccabeus purified,† and thus dedicated

* In Schola ſacrificiorum, problem. 1. § 3. † Chap. iv. 43.

it to God. From this was TA ENKAINIA, *the feaſt of the dedication*, John x. 22.* On which place Grotius comments; "ENKAINIZEIN, to dedicate, whence the appellation ENKAINIA, the feaſt of dedication, is in Hebrew CHANACH, which is uſed of any dedication, whether the firſt, or that which is renewed." And indeed, when the apoſtle was ſaying,† that Chriſt ENEKAINISE, *conſecrated a way* to heaven, he by no means intimated, that there was no way to heaven before that time.

XXX. But let us grant, that the Old Teſtament was then new; and that this may be proved by the word ENKEKANISTAI; let us alſo grant, that the apoſtle, ſpeaking of the ſhedding of blood, with which the teſtament was dedicated, does not look back to any time prior to that deſcribed Exod. xxiv. Yet nothing will be concluded in favor of the hypotheſis. For the Old Teſtament was certainly new at that time, not abſolutely, and in its whole ſubſtance, but only with reſpect to thoſe circumſtances, under which it was propoſed to Iſrael, promiſing them the immediate poſſeſſion of the land of Canaan, for an inheritance, together with the impoſition of ſo many new rites. We ought to be upon our guard againſt being guilty of the ſophiſm, called arguing from what is hypothetical to what is abſolute. As theſe things are neither unſkilfully nor improbably obſerved by very learned men, I could have wiſhed, that hard ſaying had not dropt from the learned perſon, that they who thus proceed, "wreſt this paſſage contrary to the meaning of the Holy Ghoſt." Is this a diſpute of ſuch a nature, that it cannot be determined, without ſuch thunders and lightnings of language?

XXXI. On Deut. v. 2, 3. many things have been taken notice of by interpreters. Nothing appears to us

* John x. 22. † Heb. x. 20.

more ſimple and ſolid, than what the very learned Dutch interpreters have obſerved, to the following purpoſe: That this covenant was not entered into with the fathers, in the ſame manner, with all its circumſtances and particular laws, and in that form (as we uſe to ſpeak) in which it was revealed to Iſrael at Sinai or Horeb. For even the believing patriarchs had the ſubſtance of the moral and ceremonial law, and, by the grace of God, managed their religious worſhip according to it. This expoſition is confirmed chiefly by two reaſons. 1. That it is no new thing in the ſacred writings, for ſomething not mentioned before to be ſaid, and revealed at that time, when it is more clearly diſcovered, and ſome new additions made to it. Thus the apoſtle writes concerning the myſtery of the goſpel, *Which was kept ſecret ſince the world began, but now is made manifeſt:** and yet the ſame apoſtle ſays, *preached before the goſpel to Abraham*,† and to the other ancient fathers.‡ It was therefore kept ſecret not ſimply, but in a comparative ſenſe; not preached in the ſame manner, as now. The apoſtle himſelf thus explains the matter: *Which in other ages was not made known unto the ſons of men, as it is now revealed to his holy apoſtles.*§ What God here ſays may be taken in the ſame ſenſe; that he did not make this covenant with their fathers, namely in the ſame manner and form, by ſpeaking to them from the midſt of thunderings and lightnings, giving them the law of the covenant written with his own hand, with an addition of ſo many ceremonies. 2. Nor can theſe words of God only be explained to the ſame ſenſe, but they alſo ſeem to require the very ſame meaning. For ſince the decalogue, which conſtitutes the principal part of the federal precepts, was likewiſe, with reſpect to its ſubſtance, given

* Rom. xvi. 25, 26. † Gal. iii. 8. ‡ Heb. iv. 2. § Eph. iii. 5.

to the ancient patriarchs, as God's covenant-people, for a rule of gratitude and a new life; and the sum of it was comprized in those words, with which God, when he formerly entered into covenant with Abraham, addressed him, *I am the almighty God; walk continually before me, and be thou* [sincere] *perfect;** it cannot therefore absolutely be denied, that that covenant, whose first and principal law is the decalogue, was also entered into with the ancient patriarchs. Neither, as has been often hinted, do all the ceremonies owe their original to Sinai or Horeb. From the whole I conclude, that it cannot be proved from the alledged passages, that the Old Testament took its first commencement from the departure out of Egypt, or from mount Sinai; and that it is more probable, and more agreeable to the analogy of scripture, to adhere to the received opinion. But how great the difference is between the œconomy of the Old and New Testament, and what prerogatives the last has above the first, we shall explain, but not in a careless manner, in its proper time and place.

* Gen. xvii. 1.

The End of the First Volume.